

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1888.

THE EARLY ITALIAN DECLENSION.

(Continued from page 205.)

U-STEMS:

SING. NOM. -us (Celt. -us). Neuter -ū [Celt. (1) -u, (2) -un].

No examples occur outside of Latin. There we have -ūs for masc. stems, e.g. *magistratus*, although on the archaistic inscription of the Columna Rostrata (written in the early Empire probably) we find *macistratos*. Neuters, according to our grammars, take -ū in Nom. and all other cases of the Sing. (except the Gen. where they take -ūs), e.g. *cornū, verū*, but generally interchange with masc. stems, e.g. *cornus*, or take the O-Stem -m, e.g. *verum*.

GEN. (1) *oyōs* (1 *ous*), (2) -ūis (Celt. *avos* [-ovos], -ūs). [In both Italian and Celtic Idg. EU becomes on.]

In Old Latin -uos, e.g. *de senatuos sententiad* on the S. C. de Bacch., and so in Faliscan, with loss of final -s, *de zenatuo sententiad*, Zv. 70. The classical form is -ūs, e.g. *domus*, although we are told that Augustus always used the suffix -os, *domos* (Suet. Oct. 87). From 150 B.C. we get -ūis, e.g. *anuis*, Ter., which reminds us of the Cons. Stem gen. e.g. *gruis, suis*. Very frequent from the time of Plautus to the end of the Republic is the O-Stem gen. -i, e.g. *senati* (the usual form in Cicero's time), *laci*, C.I.L. I 584, one of the many instances of that close connexion between U- and O-Stems which in classical Latin has left its mark in the perplexing declension of *domus*.

In Oscan we have only one example, *castrovs* (= fundi), Zv. 231, since *senateis* 136, *senateis* 231 (= *senatūs*) are O-declension genitives. In Umbrian *trifor* (for an earlier **trifos*) Tab. Ig. (= tribūs). [OU becomes in Latin ū, in Umbrian ō].

DAT. (1) -ou, (2) ūi. (Celt. -ū [rather -ou, for a recently found Gaulish inscr. (Bull.

Epigr. vi. 6) has *Taranou* (to the god Taranus, cf. Luc. 1, 446)).

(1) The old Latin suffix is ū, which is common in the older poets, and occurs sometimes in Virgil, e.g. *Aen.* 1, 257, *Parce metu, Cytherea*. Aulus Gellius favours this form, and tells us it was the one used by Caesar (iv. 16). It seems to survive in some usages at least of the 2nd Supine, e.g. *lepida memoratu* (cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 62, *lepida memoratui*). In Umbrian, -ō, e.g. *trifo* (= tribui), Tab. Ig.

(2) Along with this (which some call an Instrumental Case), we find in Latin a dative in -ūi, which like the gen. in -uis reminds us of the Consonant Declension, cf. *grui, sui*, and this became the classical form, e.g. *metui, anui*. Varro and Nigidius, according to Gellius (iv. 16), preferred e.g. *senatui, domui, fluctui* for the dat., and *senatuis, domuis, fluctuis* for the gen.

ACC. -um (Celt. -um [-un]).

In Latin -um, e.g. *tribum, manum*. In Oscan -im in *manim*, Zv. 231. In Umbrian -o, (the O-Stem ending?), with loss of final -m, in *trifo*, Tab. Ig. but -im, -i in *sim, si* (= suem), Tab. Ig. (probably a U-Stem).

VOC. like nom. in Latin. No instance in any other dialect. (Celt. -avo [-ovo]).

ABL. -ūd. In Latin, *magistratūd* (written *magistratuo*) on the S. C. de Bacch., then, with loss of -d, -ū, e.g. *magistratu*, and the 2nd Supine in certain usages. It seems to be sometimes confused with the O-Stem abl. -ō, e.g. *sortito, inconsulto* beside *sortitu, inconsultu, injussu*. In Oscan -id in *castrid*, Zv. 231; *meddicud* (= *magistratu*) on the same inscr. is doubtful. In Umbrian -i (after loss of final -d), e.g. *mani* (masc.), *atputrati* (= *arbitratu*), *trefi*, Tab. Ig. Umbrian *su maronato* (= sub *magistratu*), Inscr. 2, seems to be an O-Stem Abl. like Lat. *sortito, &c.*

Loc. No certain examples. In Latin *domi* is an O-Stem loc., *qua noctu* may be abl. Umbrian *manuve* (= in manu) (possibly **manove*), Tab. Ig. II B 23, is more likely, but may have the prep. -e (for *en*, Lat. in) affixed. Late Umbrian *maronatei* (magistratu), Inscr. 1, seems to be a Loc. The -ei here may represent long *i*.

INSTR. (see under Dat.)

PLURAL NOM. -ūs (which might represent an older **oyēs*?) (Celt. -aves, -ūs [both doubtful]). Neuter (nom., acc.) -uā, -uyā.

Of masc. Stems we have no instances outside Latin, e.g. *magistratūs*. Neuters have in Latin -ua, e.g. *genua* (Virg. A. 5, 432 *genua labant*), in Old Umbrian -uva, -va e.g. *vatura*, (a doubtful word), *berva* (= *verua*, Old Irish *beura*, a gloss on *sudes*), Tab. Ig., and in Late Umbrian -uo, e.g. *vatu*, Tab. Ig. The interchange of *a* and *o* in Umbrian may perhaps point to original *ā* (see under NOM. SING. of A-Stems).

GEN. -uom [possibly from **ovom*]. (Celt. -avōm [-ovom]).

In Latin we have no example of an older ending than -uum, e.g. *curruum*, which we sometimes find contracted, e.g. *currum*, Virg. A. 6, 653.

DAT. ABL. LOC. INSTR. -ūbos (where *b* represents Idg. BH. (Celt. -ubis)).

In Latin the suffix contained the *u* vowel only in *tribubus* and *arcubus*. With other words it sank sooner or later to -ibus (conf. *trebibus*, Eph. Epigr. II. 299), so that the *u* preceding the labial must have had the same *y* sound as *u* with labials in such words as *optumus*, *lubens*, which the Emperor Claudius expressed by the same sign as the *y* of Greek loan-words, e.g. *cygnus*. In Umbrian we have -us in *berus* (= *veribus*), Tab. Ig. which may be a development of **uys*, [Idg. BH becomes *f* in Umbrian].

ACC. -uns or -uns (Celt. -ūss [from an earlier -uns]). In Latin -ūs, e.g. *tribus*. In Umbrian -uvof, -uvo, -uo e.g. Middle Umbrian *kastruvuf*, *kastruvu*, Late *castrus* Tab. Ig.

In Old Umbrian we have the contracted *manf* (= *manus*), II A 38.

OJ-STEM:—SING. NOM. Latin *bōs* (*bovis* in Varro *Sat. Men.* 3), cf. *Iovos*, Eph. Ep. I 24 (Celt. *bōus*). GEN. Latin *bōvis* (Celt. *bovos*). DAT. Latin *bōvi* (Celt. *bovi*).

ACC. Latin *bōvem*. Old Umbrian *bum* (where *u* probably represents *ō*), Tab. Ig. II A 5. (Celt. *bovem* [*boven*]).

VOC. Latin *bōs*.

ABL. INSTR. Latin *bōve*, earlier *bovid* on Spoleto Inscr. Late Umbrian *bue*, Tab. Ig.

PLUR. NOM. Latin *bōves* (Celt. *bāves* [Idg. *ō* = Celt. *ā*]). GEN. Latin *bōum*.

Late Umbrian *buo*, Tab. Ig. VI A 54. (Celt. *bovōm* [*bovōn*]). DAT. Latin *būbus* and *bōbus* (Celt. *bovebis*).

ACC. Latin *bōves*, Old and Late Umbrian *buf*, Tab. Ig. (Celt. *bōss*).

[The *b* in the Latin words is contrary to the Phonetic Laws of Latin, (we should expect **vos* not *bos*, cf. *venio*, *veru* &c.), and makes it possible that the term may have been borrowed from some Italian dialect].

The foregoing may be supplemented by the few relics of the *Jov*-stem in Umbrian, Oscan, etc. GEN. SING. Oscan *Iovets*, Zv. 82, 142, Marrucine *Ioves patres* 8.

DAT. Oscan *Iuvei* 112 bis, *Diovei* 87 A, B, *Διοῦφεϊ* *Veστορεϊ* *ταυροῦ* 238. Marsic *Iove* 40 (a doubtful instance), Umbrian (Old and Late) *Iuve*, Tab. Ig. [The Umbrian and Oscan forms might possibly allow the *o* of the stem to have been *ō* in this case]. VOC. Old Umbrian *Iupater*, Tab. Ig. II B 24 (which might represent **Iō* from original **Iou*).

I-STEMS:—

SING. NOM. -is (Celt. -is). Neut. (nom. and acc.) -i [Celt. -i and -in].

In Latin we have -is sometimes, e.g. *canēs* fem., *feles*, but the classical form is -is, for which we have now and then in old Latin -e, the final -s having been dropped, e.g. *tribunos militares*, C.I.L. 1 63. LI- and RI-Stems often lose the last syllable, e.g. *vigil*, *acer*, *imber*, while TI-Stems have -s with absorption of *ti*, e.g. *Arpinds* (so accented according to Latin grammarians). Neuters have -ē, e.g. *mare*, *rete*, except LI- and RI-Stems when a long vowel precedes the liquid, e.g. *animal*, *exemplar* (but Lucr. 2, 124 *exemplare*). Oscan *aidil* (= *aedilis*), Zv. 148 and *cevs* (= *civis*) 231 are both slightly doubtful instances.

In Umbrian RI- and TI-Stems (no instance of an LI-Stem) are treated as in Latin, e.g. *ocar* (= *ocris*, mons), *Casilos* (= *Casilas*), Tab. Ig. Adj. RI-Stems have the same form in the fem. too, e.g. *pacersei* (= *propitius*, *propitia* sis), Tab. Ig. *Sakre* Inscr. 1, *verfale* Tab. Ig. VI A 8 seem to be neuters. In Marrucine we have *paceri* (= *propitia* sit?), Zv. 8; in Marsic an acc. neut., *pacre* 39, and perhaps the same in Pelignian, *deti* (= *dives*?) 13.

GEN. -eis (Celt. -ayos [-eyos]).

In Latin -is, e.g. *Arpinatis*, *acris*, earlier -eis, e.g. *Genuateis* C.I.L. I 199. In Oscan -eis, e.g. *Loekanteis*, fem. 81. In Umbrian -es, later -er and -ir (?), e.g. *ocrer*, *Tarsinater*, Tab. Ig., *sorsalir* ib. VI B 38; and so in Marrucine *ocres* 8, *Tarineris* masc (?) 8.

DAT. -ei (Celt. -ei).

In Latin *-ei* in *urbei*, *C.I.L.* I 206; but the classical form is *-i*, *urbi*.

In Umbrian *-e*, e.g. *ocre*, *Casilate*.

Acc. *-im* (Celt. *-im*).

Latin *-im*, e.g. *partim*, but usually by analogy of Consonant Stems (1), *-em*, e.g. *partem*; Oscan *-im* in *slāgim*, fem. Zv. 136 bis, *sakrim* (= *sacrem) 129, *-i*, with loss of *-m* in *tiurri* (= *turrim*) 160, 161; Umbrian *-im*, *-em*, *-i*, *-e*, e.g. *spantim*, *ocrem*, *spanti*, *sevakue*, Tab. Ig.

Voc. like nom. in Latin. No instance in any other dialect. (Celt., like nom).

Abl. *-id*.

In Latin we have *marid*, *navaled* on the archaistic inscription on the Columna Rostrata, and so *loucarid*, Eph. Epigr. II 298, but *-i*, and *-ē* (?) Instr. Case) are the classical forms, e.g. *turri*, *turre*. In Oscan, *slaagid*, Zv. 136, *akrid* 129 (plebeian inscription). In Umbrian, *-i*, *-e*, *-ei*, e.g. *ocri*, *ocre*, *peracrei*, Tab. Ig., forms which indicate long *i*. To these we may perhaps add Sabine *Flusare* (= *Florali*, loc. ?), Zv. 10, and Pelignian *fertid* (= *fertili* ?) 13.

Loc. *-ei* (?).

Latin *-i*, e.g. *mari* (abl. ?). Umbrian *-e*, e.g. *ocre*, Tab. Ig.

INSTR. Some of the abl. forms without *-d* may be relics of the Instrumental Case.

PLUR. NOM. *-eis* (from older **ejēs* ?) (Celt. *-eyes*, *-eis*). Neut. *-iā*.

In Latin usually *-ēs*, seldom *-īs* or *-eis*, e.g. *ovēs*, *trēs*, *ceivēs*, *C.I.L.* I 198, *fineis* and *finis* 199.

Neuters take *-iā* in early Latin, (some traces of this scansion seem to occur in Plautus), then *-iā*, e.g. *tria*. In Oscan *-is* (which may represent original *ēs*) in the one instance we have, the loan-word *aīdilis*, Zv. 142. In Umbrian *-es*, later *er*, e.g. *pacrer*, Tab. Ig. VI B 61. Neut. *-ia* and *-io* (which points to original *ā*), also *-eo*, e.g. *triia*, Tab. Ig. IV 2, *trio-per* (= *ter*) VI B 55, VII A 51, *sakreu* V A 6. Pelignian *pacris* (= *propitiae* ?), Zv. 13, is doubtful.

GEN. *-iom* (Celt. *-ayōm* [-*eyon*]).

In Latin *ium*, e.g. *civium*, *Arpinatium*, though sometimes, by confusion with Cons. Stems, *-um*, e.g. *vatum*. Oscan *Tiatiūm*, on a coin, Zv. 256, is certain; [*a*] *ittiom* (= *portionum* ?) 136 very doubtful. In Umbrian, with loss of *-m*, *peracnio*, Tab. Ig. VI. A 54.

DAT. ABL. LOC. INSTR. *-ibos* [where *b* represents Idg. BH]. (Celt. *-ibis*).

In Latin we have *-ibūs*, e.g. *imbribus*, *avibus*, though some traces of the length of the last syllable seem to occur in Plautus. On the archaistic inscription of the Columna

Rostrata, *navebos*, and so *Calebus* Eph. Epigr. I 8. Oscan *teremmiss* (boundaries), Zv. 136, is very doubtful; *Anafriss* (= *Imbribus* ?) 87 A, B, not quite certain. In Umbrian *-is* and *-es*, which do not become *-ir* and *-er* in Late Umbrian (so probably earlier **-iss*, **-ess*, for **-ifs*), e.g. *avis*, *aves*, Tab. Ig. We get *aveis* VI A 1.

Acc. *ins* (?) (Celt. *-eyess*, *-eiss* [the double *s* indicates an earlier nasal]).

In Latin apparently the oldest ending is *-ēs*, then *-eis*, then *-īs*, but the acc. pl. of I-Stems is a difficult point to settle, and was found so by the Roman grammarians themselves. On the archaistic inscription of the Columna Rostrata we have *clases*, *claseis*, *Cartaciniensis* side by side. In Old Umbrian *-ef*, *-if*, *-e*, in Late Umbrian *-if*, *-i*, *-eif*, *-ei*, e.g. *avef*, *tref*, *avif*, *trif*, *tre*, *ovi* (= *oves*), *aveif*, *treif*, *arvei*, forms which indicate long *i*.

Voc. same as nom. (in Celt same as acc.). No instances except in Latin.

CONS. STEMS:—SING. NOM. *-s* (Celt. *-s*). Neuter (nom. and acc.), the bare stem.

Guttural Stems: *-x* (Celt. *-x*). In Latin, *-x*, e.g. *index* (= **ius-dic-s*), *vox*, *lex*, *nix*, *conuix*, which in the Early Empire becomes *-s*, e.g. *coius*. Neuters, e.g. *halec*, but neut. adjs. take the masc. suffix, e.g. *felix pecus*. Oscan *meddiss* (= **med-dic-s*, *magistratus*), Zv. 100, *meddis* 138. Marsic *medis* 43; Volscian *medix* 47; Pelignian *pristafalacirix* (= **praestabulatrix*) 13; Marrucine *lixs* (= *lex*, or *leges* ?) is not quite certainly nom. sing.

Labial Stems: *-ps*. No instances outside of Latin, and few there, e.g. *stips*, *princeps*. No B-Stems, *urbs* &c. being I-Stems with syncope of the vowel. Neuter *volup* is probably for *volupe*.

Dental Stems: *-s* (Celt. *-s* except NT-Stems which end in vowel, e.g. **cariā* for original **cariantis*). In Latin *-s*, e.g. *eques*, *fraus*, *lapis*, without compensatory lengthening except when *i* comes before *-es*, e.g. *abiēs*. NT-Stems take *-ns*, e.g. *sedens*. Neuters, e.g. *caput*; but the dental is lost after a cons., e.g. *lac(lact* in Varro, Sat. 26), *os* (bone). Oscan *manafum* (= *mandans sum* ?), in the plebeian inscription Zv. 129, is very doubtful. In Umbrian NT-Stems take *-f* (for original **-ns*), e.g. *zedef* (= *sedens*), Tab. Ig., while in Late Umbrian the *-f* is dropped, e.g. *serse* ib. Pelignian *Herentas*, Zv. 13, is probably a Dental-, not an I-Stem, Vestine *brat* fem. 11 is doubtful.

S-Stems: *-s*. Neuters usually end in the nom. and acc. in *-os* (but *-es* in gen. dat. &c.) (So with neuts. in Celt.)

In Old Latin the final syllable shows a

long vowel with *-s*, e.g. *arbōs*, later *-r*, the vowel losing its length, e.g. *arbōr*, *decor*. Neut. *stircus*, Eph. Epigr. II 298, *decus*, *genus* (gen. *generis*), but neut. adjs. often take masc. form, e.g. *bellum Punicum posterior*, Cassius Hemina ap. Priscian VII p. 347. In Umbrian we have the neuts. *meds* (= *ius* ?) and *erus*, Tab. Ig. Pelignian *uus* (= *annum* ?), Zv. 13, is possibly an acc. neut.

R-Stems (relations and agents) *-r* with long preceding vowel. (so Celt.)

In Latin the vowel is shortened before final *-r*, e.g. *patrēr*, *cenśōr*. Oscan *censtur* (= *cenśōr*), Zv. 231. Neut. *far* on plebeian inscr. 129. In Umbrian *arfertur* and Late Umbrian *arsfertur*, Tab. Ig., the *u* probably indicates an *Ū*-vowel. Neut. *far*, *pir* (= *πῑρ*), and perhaps *utur* (*ῥῥωρ*) II B 15 where the *u* may represent short *O*. Pelignian *casnar* (= *senex*, cf. *cānus*), Zv. 14, *usur* (= *uxōr*) 23, *Salavatur* (= *Salvatōr*) 25. Faliscan *mate* (= *mater*) in a plebeian inscription 62, *pretod* (for *pretor* ?) *de zenatuo sententia* 70, *uzor* on a Corchiano inscription.

N-Stems: (1) long vowel (so Celt.) (2) *-ns*(?). Neut. *MEN*-stems in *-men* with weak pronunciation of final nasal (Celt. *-me*).

(1) In Latin *ō*, e.g. *caro*, *statio*, even in the oldest times, e.g. *virco* on the Dvenos Inscr. 5th cent. A.U.C., Neut. e.g. *nomen*. So in Middle Umbrian *karufem*, *tribitufem*. (= **triplicio*), Tab. Ig. V A 9, in both of which the nature of the *-u* is uncertain. Neut., Old Umbrian *numem*, Late Umbrian *nome*.

(2) The *-f* in Oscan *statif* (= *statio* ?), Zv. 87 *A. fruktatiuf* fem. (= **fructatio* ?) *tribarakkiuf*, fem., *ōitiuf* (= **usio*), all on 136, would represent original **-ns*. (In the older Latin writers we have sometimes *carnis* &c. for *caro* &c. (Priscian VI 17), apparently by false analogy).

GEN. (1) *-os* (2) *-eis* (the I-Stem gen ?) (Celt. *-os*).

(1) In Old Latin *-us*, e.g. *patrus*, C.I.L. I 1469, *nominus*, in S. C. de Bacch., *hominus*, Lex. Agr.

(2) In Old Latin *-es*, e.g. *Salutes pocolom*, *Apolones*, C.I.L. I 187: in classical Latin *-is*, e.g. *Salutis*, *Apollinis*; in Oscan *-eis*, e.g. *medikeis*, Zv. 142, *maatreis* 108, *Appelluneis* 156a; in Late Umbrian *-er*, *farer*, *nomner*, Tab. Ig., *matrer* Inscr. 2; Marrucine *patres* Zv. 8.

DAT. *-ei* (same as I-Stem dat ?) (Celt. *-i* [*-ei*]).

In Old Latin *-e*, e.g. *Iunone*, C.I.L. I 1200, *matre* on a Pisaurum inscription, *Marte* 62; then *-ei*, e.g. *patrei* 807, *voluptatei* 1008, *Apolinei* 562; in classical Latin *-i*, e.g. *patri*, although in legal phrases e.g. *iure dicundo*

the archaic form is sometimes retained. In Oscan, *-ei*, e.g. *medikei*, Zv. 136, (*Herentatei* 140 ?) *sverrunei* 136, A) *πελλωνει* 253, *leginei* 129 (a plebeian inscription). In Umbrian *-e*, e.g. *adferture*, *patre*, *nomne*, Tab. Ig.

ACC. *-m* (Celt. *-em* [from original *-m*]).

In Latin *-em*, e.g. *patrem*, *legionem* or, with loss of final *-m*, e, e.g. *apice*, Ep. Scip.; in Oscan *-om*, *medicatinom* (= **meddicationem*), Zv. 231, and the doubtful *leginom* (= *legionem* ?) on the plebeian inscription 129. Umbrian *-o*, e.g. *arsferturo* (= **adfertorem*), *capirso* (= *capidem*), Tab. Ig. Pelignian *aetatu* (= *aetatem* ?) 13 is doubtful.

VOC. like nom. (so Celt.).

Latin e.g. *pater*, *legiō*. Umbrian *Iupater*, Tab. Ig. II B 24.

ABL. *-ed* (?)

In Old Latin *coventionid* in the S. C. de Bacch., *dictatore* on the Columna Rostrata, then *-ē*, e.g. Plaut. *Stich.* 71 *Grátiam* a *patrē* si *petimus*, *spéro* ab eo *impetrassere*; cf. *aire moltaticod*, C.I.L. I 181, and in classical Latin *-ē* (I Instr. Case), e.g. *conventione*, *patre*, *aere*. In Oscan *praesentiid*, Zv. 231, may possibly be an I-Stem; the incomplete form *donte* (= *dente*) on the plebeian inscription, Zv. 129, points to *-ed* as the abl. suffix; *ligud* fem. (= *lege*) 231 is a strange form, with which may be compared *tanginod* fem. 136, *tanginud* 143, 281, if this be an N-Stem. In Umbrian *-e*, e.g. *pure*, *nomne*, *menzne* (= **mensione*, *mense*), *natine*, but *-i* in *pedi* (= *pede*), Tab. Ig.

Pelignian *aetate*, Zv. 14, Sabine *mesene* (= **mensione*, *mense*) 10, Marrucine *agine* (= *sacrificio*) 8, likewise shew *-e*.

LOC. *-i*.

In Latin *-ē* and *-i* (by confusion with I-Stems), e.g. *Carthagine*, *Carthagini*. Oscan *Ahudiuni* (= **Aquilone*, 'in the north' ?) Zv. 172 is extremely doubtful.

INSTR. *-ē*.

The so-called ablative forms in *-ē* without *-d* may be Instrumental forms.

PLUR. NOM. *-ēs* (Celt. *-es*). Neuter (nom. and acc.) *-a* (Celt. *-a*).

The short vowel is still found in Plautus in *forēs*, e.g. *Mil.* 410 *sed fóres vicini próximi creperunt: conticiscam*. We have the final *-s* dropt in *matrona Pisaurese dono dedrot* (= *matronae Pisaurenses donum dederunt*) on an inscription from Pisaurum in Umbria, C.I.L. I 173. The classical Latin suffix is borrowed from the I-declension (?) *-ēs*, e.g. *fratres*, *ensores*, *stationes*, *homines*.

Neuters take *-a*, the original quantity of which is doubtful. We have no examples outside Latin.

In Oscan, the syncopated forms *meddeic* (= **meddicēs*), Zv. 253, *censtur* (= *cenśōrēs*)

20, 231, *kenzsur* 83, *homuns* (= *hominēs*), (probably a nom.), on the plebeian inscription 129 indicate a short suffix-vowel. Umbrian *frateer* (= *fratres*), Tab. Ig., shows a lengthening (by compensation?) of the final syllable of the stem. In Pelignian, *medix* 33 recalls the Oscan form; *brats* 35 is very doubtful.

GEN. -om (Celt. -ōm [-on]), in R-Stems -iōm [-ion]).

In Old Latin -om, e.g. *poumilionom*, Eph. Epigr. I 20, classical -um, e.g. *fratrum*, but sometimes (by confusion with I-Stems) -ium, esp. NT-Stems, e.g. *sedentium* (whereas in Celt. NT-Stems have -on like the others). In Umbrian *fratrom*, and, with loss of -m, *fratru* (for **fratro*), Tab. Ig., probably indicate the short Ō-vowel. In Pelignian we have *Semunusva* (= *Semonumque*), Zv. 13.

DAT. ABL. INSTR. LOC. -bos (where *b* represents Idg. BH) (Celt. -ebis [-bis ?]).

In Old Latin we have -ebus, e.g. *Tempestatebus*, Ep. Scip., and some lines of Plautus &c. point to a long final syllable, but the classical

form is -ibūs, e.g. *Tempestatibus*, *fratribus*, *hominibus*. In Oscan, *ligis* (= *legibus*), Zv. 231, is a form hard to explain.

In Umbrian we have -us (which never becomes -ur, and so probably represents an older *-uss, *-ufs), e.g. *fratrus* (originally **fratrus* ?), *kapitūs*, *homonus*, *karnus* (originally **karnus* ?), Tab. Ig.

ACC. -ns (Celt. -ēs [from -ns], in R-Stems -ess). In Latin -ēs, e.g. *fruges*, *pedes*. In Umbrian -f with syncope of vowel, e.g. *nerf* (= *proceres*, cf. Nero, Gk. ἀνὴρ), *capif* and *kapi* (= *capides*), *frif* (= *fruges*), Tab. Ig. So Pelignian *pes* (= *ped(e)s*), Zv. 16.

VOC. Same as nom. (Celt. same as acc.), e.g. Latin *fratres*, *homines* &c.

It only remains to write out in full some examples of what we may conceive the Early Italian Declension to have been, along with the declension which Stokes assigns to their Celtic cognates (vid. Stokes on 'Protoceltic Paradigms' on pp. 162 sqq. of Bezzenberger XI. 1-2). We omit the Celtic dual.

Ā-STEMS.

Example: *toutā* 'community.' (Celt. *tōtā*).

	Sing.	Plur.		Sing.	Plur.
Nom.	<i>toutā</i>	<i>toutās, toutāi</i>		<i>tōtā</i>	<i>tōtās</i>
Gen.	<i>toutās, toutāi</i>	<i>toutāsōm</i>		<i>tōtēs</i>	<i>tōtōn</i> (?)
Dat.	<i>toutāi, toutā</i>	<i>toutābos</i>		<i>tōtē</i>	<i>tōtābos, tōtābis</i>
Acc.	<i>toutām</i>	<i>toutāns</i>		<i>tōten</i>	<i>tōtāss</i>
Voc.	<i>toutā</i>	<i>toutās, toutāi</i>		<i>tōtā</i>	<i>tōtāss</i>
Abl.	<i>toutād</i>	(Dat. or Instr.)		<i>tōtād</i>	
Loc.	<i>toutāi</i>	(Dat. or Instr.)		<i>totē</i>	
Instr.	<i>toutā</i>	<i>toutājs</i>			

O-STEMS.

Example: *vīro* 'man.' (Celt. *fīro*).

	Sing.	Plur.		Sing.	Plur.
Nom.	<i>vir(ōs)</i>	<i>virōs, vīroi</i>		<i>fīrōs</i>	<i>fīroi</i>
Gen.	<i>vireis, virī</i>	<i>virōm</i>		<i>fīrī</i>	<i>fīrōn</i>
Dat.	<i>virōi, virō</i>	(Instr.)		<i>fīrū</i>	<i>fīrōbis</i>
Acc.	<i>virōm</i>	<i>virōns</i>		<i>fīrōn</i>	<i>fīrōss</i>
Voc.	<i>vir(ē)</i>	<i>virōs, vīroi</i>		<i>fīrē</i>	<i>fīrōss</i>
Abl.	<i>virōd</i>	(Instr.)		—	
Loc.	<i>virēi</i>	(Instr.)		<i>fīrei</i>	
Instr.	<i>virō</i>	<i>virōjs</i>			

CONSONANT-STEMS.

Example: *māter* 'mother.' (Celt. *māter*).

	Sing.	Plur.		Sing.	Plur.
Nom.	<i>māter</i>	<i>mater(ē)s</i>		<i>mātir</i>	<i>mātrēs</i>
Gen.	<i>mātros, mātreis</i>	<i>mātrōm</i>		<i>mātrōs</i>	<i>mātrīon</i>
Dat.	<i>mātrei</i>	<i>mātrōs</i> ²		<i>mātrī</i>	<i>mātrebis</i>
Acc.	<i>māterm</i>	<i>materns</i>		<i>mātren</i>	<i>mātriēss</i>
Voc.	<i>māter</i>	<i>mater(ē)s</i>		<i>māter</i>	<i>mātriēss</i>
Abl.	<i>mātrēd</i> ¹	(Dat.)			
Loc.	<i>māterī</i>	(Dat.)			
Instr.	<i>mātrē</i>	(Dat.)			

WALLACE M. LINDSAY.

¹ e indicates a vowel of uncertain quality.

² b indicates original BH.

USENER'S *EPICUREA*.

Epicurea: edidit HERMANNUS USENER. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri. 1887. 16 Mk.

A COLLECTION of the fragments that remain of Epicurus has long been an acknowledged want, but there has hitherto been a certain hesitation on the part of scholars to undertake the work owing to a sense, no doubt, of its magnitude and of the manifold difficulties which surround it. These difficulties however Professor Usener has resolutely faced, giving us not only the book we want, but also one which is to my mind in every way a model of what a collection of Fragments should be.

The general arrangement of the matter in this volume is very lucid and simple. First of all we have the three Letters of Epicurus and the *Κίρια δόξαι*, from Diogenes Laertius; (2) the Fragments of lost writings, whenever they can be assigned to definite works; (3) the Fragments which cannot be referred to a definite work—these being very conveniently marshalled under three main heads, *Canonica*, *Physica*, *Ethica*, with sections and subsections for the subordinate divisions of the subject; (4) the life of Epicurus, from Laertius, and also that in Suidas. As a sort of Appendix to the whole the editor adds what he terms a 'subsidiium interpretationis'—a detailed analysis of the three Letters point by point, together with a series of references to the parallel or complementary statements to be found elsewhere, whether in the fragments of Epicurus himself, or in the writings of his followers and imitators, like Lucretius, for instance: the *Κίρια δόξαι* too are illustrated by testimonia in just the same way. We have thus the materials not only for a complete commentary on the documents themselves, but also for a systematic exposition of Epicureanism fuller and better attested than anything of the kind we have at present; it will not be so difficult henceforth to write on Epicurus now that the data are to be found ready to hand in such excellent form and order.

In the Preface the editor considers some of the critical questions connected with Laertius, which have to be settled before one can deal with the texts preserved in his tenth Book. As to the origin of our existing Laertius his conclusion is briefly this. The compilation presupposes as its basis an

older book of *Lives*, dating presumably from the first century of our era: some reader then (we may call him Laertius or not, as we will) supplemented his copy by various additions, adding to the chapter on Epicurus, for instance, the three Letters etc.—much in the same way as we now sometimes in an interleaved copy of a book insert on the blank pages any addenda that happen to interest us: in the third stage this copy with its heterogeneous matter (*i.e.* the original text and supplementary accretions) fell into the hands of a copyist who transcribed the contents of the book as they stood in the MS. without any thought of redaction or literary form. Our existing Laertius is certainly just such a formless and unconnected whole as would arise in the way the editor supposes; and as an explanation of the facts the hypothesis has to my mind every mark of probability and truth. Another important section of the Preface deals with the question of the sources of our extant Fragments of Epicurus. Very few of our authorities can be credited with a first-hand knowledge of his writings, which came in time to be utterly forgotten, as epitomes and manuals took the place of the original literature. The editor shows that even of the three Letters the second is only an epitome made up of extracts from the *Περὶ φύσεως*; that the *Κίρια δόξαι* are another compilation of the same kind; that the *γνώμαι* scattered about our various *Gnomologia* came in the last resort from a great collection of Excerpts; and that even Seneca in all probability had recourse to some such collection for many of his quotations from Epicurus.

As regards the texts contained in this volume, those from Laertius appear in an entirely new form, having been systematically re-edited from the MSS.—so that we can now see from this specimen what a critical edition of Laertius ought to be, and how faulty and misleading all our existing editions are. The editor's fine critical tact and sense are conspicuous in every page, and he has given us a goodly number of emendations of the kind which in old days would have been called 'palmary.' I may mention just a few of these. P. 6, 8 (= D.L. x. 40) the editor restores *τόπος δὲ*, for *τὸ πρόσθεν*: p. 60, 10 (= D.L. x. 124) *βλάβαι τε*, for *βλάβαι αἰται*: p. 80, 4 (= D.L. x. 152) *ἀλλ'*

εἰς τὰ πράγματα βλέποντων, for ἀλλὰ πλείοστα πράγματα βλέποντων: p. 367, 11 (= D.L. x. 16) τοῖπος, for πρῶτος: p. 370, 4 (= D.L. x. 28) ἀ δὲ αὐτῷ δοκεῖ, for μίαν δὲ αὐτῷ δοκεῖ. Very felicitous too is his discovery in Stob. *Flor.* xvii. 14 (p. 345, 33), where the lemma Ἀπολλώνιος Εἰδομένη is shown to be a mistake for Ἐπικούρος Ἰδομενεί; the passage therefore is now seen to come not from Apollonius, but from Epicurus, and moreover from a letter to one of the best known of his disciples. With texts so difficult and corrupt as those which the editor has had to put into shape one cannot expect corrections to be always quite so convincing as those just quoted. In p. 95, 15 (= D.L. x. 119), for instance, the text as corrected runs thus:—ἀλλὰ καὶ πηρωθεὶς τὰς ὄψεις καταξιοῖ αὐτὸν τοῦ βίου, the MSS. having μετὰξαι or μετὰξιν: I should prefer, therefore, ἀλλὰ καὶ πηρωθέντα τὰς ὄψεις μὴ ἐξάξιν αὐτὸν τοῦ βίου—on the assumption that Epicurus was directly controverting the Stoic notion that blindness was a sufficient reason for suicide (εὐλόγως τέ φασιν ἐξάξιν εἰναι τοῦ βίου τὸν σοφὸν καὶ ὑπὲρ πατρίδος καὶ ὑπὲρ φίλων, κἂν ἐν σκληροτέρᾳ γένηται ἀλγηδὼν ἢ πηρώσεσιν ἢ νόσοις ἀνάτοις. D.L. vii. 130; comp. Cic. *Tusc.* v. 110).

I may perhaps be allowed to note some passages in which the received text still seems open to improvement. P. 4, 4 (= D.L. x. 36) ταῖς ἐπιβολαῖς δέξως δύνασθαι χρῆσθαι: I think we should restore here δέξαις, and a little further on (p. 12, 2 = D.L. x. 49) ὥκαις, such Ionicisms being specially liable to maltreatment at the hands of scribes. P. 53, 10 (= D.L. x. 113) τὸ δὲ μίαν αἰτίαν

τούτων ἀποδιδόναι, πλεοναχῶς τῶν φαινομένων ἐκκαλονμένων: perhaps we should read πλεοναχᾶς. P. 72, 7 (= D.L. x. 140) οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας συμβαίνει: the true reading would seem to be συμμένει; the subject is τὸ ἀλγοῦν, and the sentence begins with οὐ χρονίζει τὸ ἀλγοῦν συνεχῶς ἐν τῇ σαρκί, for which οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας συμμένει is given as a reason. P. 75, 20 (= D.L. x. 145) κατέστρεψε should probably be κατέστρεψε, so as to correspond in tense with ἔφηνε and the other aorists in the context: similarly in p. 76, 8 (= D.L. x. 146) we may restore εἰ μαχῇ (or μαχεῖ) for εἰ μάχη on account of the futures in the vicinity. P. 362, 2 (= D.L. x. 6) the manuscript reading seems to point to τὰκατίδιον rather than τὰκάτιον, such a diminutive being in keeping with the affectation which so often disfigures Epicurus' style. P. 347, 2 (= *Plut. Mor.* 1097 B) οὐ πυροὺς διαπέμποντες οὐδ' ἀλφίτων μεδίμνους: the parallel in D.L. x. 11 makes one suspect that what Plutarch wrote was τυροὺς. P. 350, 2 (= Euseb. *P.E.* 767 E) εἰ διανοηθείμεν ἡμεῖς ὥσπερ οἱ ζωγράφοι καὶ πλάσσαι σκύλακας ἢ χιμαίρας: I would read Σκύλλας ἢ Χιμαίρας, the two words which from the time of Plato so often appear together to denote purely imaginary creatures. Before concluding this too brief notice of a truly admirable book I must mention the one omission I have observed in the collection of Fragments; I do not find in it the two words quoted from Epicurus by Eustathius in *Il.* i. 330 (t. 1, p. 93, 11, Stallb.), Ἐπικούρου μὲν τὸ οὐ παραγέννησις, ἦτοι ἀποδημία.

I. BYWATER.

RECENT LATIN GRAMMARS.

The Eton Latin Grammar, For Use in the Higher Forms. By FRANCIS HAY RAWLINS, M.A., and WILLIAM RALPH INGE, M.A. London: Murray, 1888. 6s.

The Revised Latin Primer. By BENJAMIN HALL KENNEDY, D.D. Longmans, 1888. 2s. 6d.

The New Latin Primer. Edited by J. P. POSTGATE, M.A., and C. H. VINCE, M.A. Cassell, 1888. 2s. 6d.

The Shorter Latin Primer, by DR. KENNEDY. Longmans, 1888. 1s.

It would be idle, at this time of day, to complain of the practice of writing grammars

for a particular school or a particular set of schools. But a protest, however vain, should be uttered against it. A good book does not need any artificial protection; a bad one does not deserve it.

A new Latin Grammar can only justify its existence in the eyes of scholars if it is written on a new method, or based upon a fresh survey of Comparative Philology and Latin literature, or if it puts information to be found elsewhere into a more lucid arrangement and a more convenient shape than any existing book of the same kind. The new *Eton Latin Grammar* has the merit of compressing a great deal of

matter into a short space, and of avoiding much of the technical terminology which afflicts some of the readers of the Public School Grammar. It is also lucid in arrangement and clear in its presentation of the facts. But it is difficult to see what other reason it has for existence. Indeed, there are two grave reasons why it should not exist at all. The first is, that the system of Comparative Philology which it adopts is antiquated—this alone should put the book out of court; the second is that the notices referring to Latin literature are perfunctory and inaccurate. The Syntax is a well-digested summary of the doctrines now generally accepted; but this merit is not sufficient to compensate for the serious defects above mentioned.

When the Head Master of the first classical school in England assures us, in the introductory notice, that 'no pains have been spared to make the work complete and up to date in the philological as well as the grammatical information contained therein,' it must not be supposed that so far as the 'philological' part of the book is concerned, he is speaking as a scholar. The fact is that the writers, for anything that appears to the contrary, would seem to have no notion at all that new methods, leading to new results, have been in the last ten or fifteen years improving the science of Comparative Philology. And this in spite of the appearance of Brugmann's *Comparative Grammar*, to say nothing of De Saussure, Victor Henry and others. The system in vogue twenty years ago they adopt entire, and without a word of comment. It is of course open to any scholar to say that he holds by the old methods: George Curtius, we know, did so to the last. But, if he does, he is bound to justify his proceeding; and this is exactly what the authors of our new Grammar fail to do. It is a thousand pities that the publication of the book could not have been postponed a year or two. The writers might then have had the benefit of the new edition of Schweizer-Sidler's *Elementar- und Formenlehre*, which it is to be hoped may soon be translated into English, or, at any rate, made the basis of a new school book on the subject.

There is as little excuse for the careless and perfunctory character of the literary notices. Whether indeed such scraps of illuminated literary cram as can be packed into the corners of an overfilled Grammar are of any value at all, may be seriously questioned. But, if we are to have cram, let it at least have the commonplace merit

of soundness. In the five first pages of this book and in Appendix III. (pp. 364—367) we find the following inaccuracies. Ennius is 'the father of Roman poetry.' Not more, surely, in some ways, than Nævius: Ennius was the father of the Greek form in Roman poetry, nothing else. Lucilius was 'the inventor of Roman Satire.' Only of a particular form of Satire: Ennius and others had written *saturæ* before him. Sallust was 'the first scientific historian of Rome.' In what sense was Sallust, or indeed any ancient historian, scientific? Or have we here a confused reminiscence of Teuffel's verdict that Sallust was 'der erste *kunstmässige* Geschichtschreiber' among the Romans? 'Trogus Pompeius wrote a long history of Macedonia.' So he did, and a great deal more history besides; *Graecæ et totius historiarum orbis*, as Justin says. Celsus is put down merely as the author of a work on medicine: but he wrote other books as important. The fact should have been mentioned, as Varro's lost writings are noticed on the preceding page. Poor Claudian is dismissed with the remark that he wrote 'hexametrical poems'; as though he wrote in no other metres than the hexameter, and as though his place in the history of literature were no higher than (say) that of the author of the *Aetna*. Nigidius Figulus is classed among the 'grammarians.' But this was not his only claim to distinction; indeed he was not, strictly speaking, a grammarian at all. The *Noctes Atticæ* of Gellius are very inadequately characterized as 'extracts from Greek and Roman writers on questions of antiquity.' Nonius Marcellus is not rightly described as 'a lexicographer,' though there is much lexicography in his book. Macrobius would have felt insulted had he known that he would be merely classed as a 'grammarian.' Martianus Capella may be called a 'grammarian,' but grammar forms a very small part of his performance. On p. 364 we read that 'Sallust was the first Latin prose writer who paid much attention to style.' Did Cicero, then, pay no attention to style? 'Some of the ancients found provincialism (*Patavinitas*) in the style of Livy.' Asinius Pollio did, but there is no evidence of any one else having done so. 'Tacitus is the leader of a short-lived reaction against the style of Cicero.' This must surely give a wrong impression. The movement against the style of Cicero began in the Augustan age, and gained strength as the first century went on, Quintilian and his pupils Tacitus and the younger Pliny (Taci-

tus, that is, in his *Dialogus*) in vain attempting to stem the current.

These shreds of perfunctory criticism—*inanis improbis, non iucunda miseris, beatis non grata, bonis non gravis*, are perhaps intended to 'meet the requirements' of the question papers set in College Scholarship examinations. If so, it is devoutly to be wished that these papers may be speedily abolished, and boys encouraged to read Sallust and Tacitus for their own sakes, and by the light of nature.

Comparisons are odious; but the ground covered by the *Revised Latin Primer* and the *New Latin Primer* is so much the same that it is hardly possible to review them separately. Dr. Kennedy's book is a thoroughly revised edition of his well-known Latin Primer. The arrangement is in some points altered. The matter which in the original Primer was contained in Appendix I. is now brought into the text under the appropriate headings: and the memorial lines on Gender are relegated to an appendix. Such technical terms as seemed 'reasonably open to objection' have been omitted. To the Accidence has been prefixed a chapter on Letters and Laws of Sound. Long vowels are marked, but vowels which have no mark of quantity are generally to be taken as short.

Prof. Postgate and Mr. Vince claim for their book that it is 'sufficiently original, as a whole, to justify its title of the *New Latin Primer*.' The quantities of words, both in closed and open syllables, are carefully marked throughout, 'the reformed pronunciation . . . fully explained,' and 'considerable simplification introduced into the Syntax, as in the treatment of the Tenses, the Subjunctive Mood, Conditional Statements, Indirect Discourse, and elsewhere.'

On the whole the book of Mr. Postgate and Mr. Vince is the more scholarly of the two, and gives the impression of being based on a fresher and more independent study of the literature. Passing over some slight inaccuracies which meet the eye in both Primers, it may be observed (1) that Mr. Postgate has been far more careful than Dr. Kennedy and his assistants in marking the quantities of words. Dr. Kennedy says (p. v.) 'that vowels which have no mark of quantity are generally to be taken as short.' Had this rule been consistently observed there would have been nothing to complain of, but it is not observed. For instance, on p. 5 *natio* is given without any marks of length; so *trado*, p. 7; *scribo*, p. 9; *jilius*, p. 17; *ver* and *penates*,

p. 32; *iugerum* and *natu*, p. 33, *antiquus*, p. 43; *ocius*, *plus*, and *plurimus*, p. 44; *amaturus*, p. 61; *velis* and *notis*, p. 88. Nor again has any trouble been taken to mark the quantity of vowels long by nature, but followed by two consonants, as e.g. in *lux*, *rex*, *regnum*, *mons*, *fons*, *rastrum*, *victrix*. (2) In the sections which treat of the sound of the letters both books are based upon the Cambridge scheme of Latin Pronunciation; but Mr. Postgate is rather fuller, and though Dr. Kennedy has a chapter on the changes of letters, which are not treated by Mr. Postgate, Dr. Kennedy's chapter is too short to be of any great use. Mr. Postgate's list of correct spellings (pp. 115-116) will, on the other hand, be of great practical service. (3) With regard to the Syntax, I have not sufficient experience of school teaching to justify my pronouncing a decided opinion on the question whether Mr. Postgate's claim to have 'considerably simplified' the treatment of some difficult points can be said to have been made out. Dr. Kennedy adheres to some of his technical terms, as 'help-word,' 'verb infinite,' 'flexion'; he adheres also to his well-known analysis of the sentence with its peculiar application of the word 'predicate.' Mr. Postgate introduces no new words, and bases his analysis of the sentence on the logical use of the terms 'subject' and 'predicate.' There is nothing to be gained by re-opening the discussion on this well-worn topic. But taking Mr. Postgate's treatment of the syntax as a whole, it is, if not simpler than Dr. Kennedy's, certainly fuller.

It will be convenient to mention a few points in which all the three Grammars under consideration might be improved.

(1) *The Pronunciation of Latin*. — All three take the Cambridge circular for a basis, and as a guide for general practice the circular does well enough. But the writers who tell us so much, and are no doubt familiar with all the facts, should have put rather more than they do into their books. In the Eton Grammar nothing is said about accent: Dr. Kennedy and Mr. Postgate give the bare rules of Latin accentuation, but say nothing of acute and circumflex, and the relation between the circumflex and long vowels. Nor, again, is the fact brought out that the orthography of classical Latin was by no means entirely phonetic; that e.g. neither *uu* nor *uo* correctly represents the sound of the last syllable of *equus*; that in all probability *imperii* (for example) was in common use pronounced *imperi*, and *imperii* was a fiction

of grammarians and poets; that in *optimus* neither *i* nor *u* exactly represented the sound of the middle syllable; that *artubus* and *portubus* were in all probability pronounced *artibus* and *portibus*; that in *vir* and *virtus* the *i* had a 'foreign' sound; that neither *ns* nor *rs* quite sounded as they were written. Again, Mr. Postgate says that *s* must always be pronounced like *ce* in *face*. This can hardly have been the case when *s* followed a final short syllable before a consonant in the next word (*infantibus parvis*). Otherwise Lucretius would not have so often elided it, nor would Sulpicius Severus have actually dropped this *s* in conversation. Such niceties as these, which cannot be neglected in a general treatment of the question, make one thing perfectly clear, and that is, that to restore the ancient pronunciation of Latin is nearly, if not quite, impossible even for a small circle of scholars. If, on the other hand, a rough and ready reform for the great mass of persons who learn Latin is all that is wanted, it might be well to confine the change to the vowels and the consonants *c* and *g*.

(2) *A use of 'ipse.'*—One misses any mention of the distinction between (say) *se ipse laudavit* and *se ipsum laudavit*. The first means 'he (and no one else) praised himself'; the second, 'he praised himself (and no one else).'

(3) *The use of 'suus.'*—All three grammars repeat the rule that *suus* usually refers to the subject of the sentence. Mr. Postgate (whose second example in § 338 is surely inappropriate) says further that *se* and *suus* always refer to 'a subject.' Certain well-known exceptions are mentioned; but the treatment of the matter, even as a question for school-boys, is inadequate and confusing. Why not recognise the fact that *suus* refers to the subject of the sentence if there is nothing else in the sentence to which it can refer, but that, if there is, it can just as easily refer to the direct or remoter object of the sentence? *Suum librum legit* must mean 'he reads his own book,' but *suas leges Karthaginiensibus confirmavit* might either mean 'he ratified his own laws for the benefit of the Carthaginians,' or (and this is far more likely) 'he ratified for the Carthaginians their own laws.' In such a sentence, in what sense is *Karthaginiensibus* the subject? I could quote fifty instances of this use from good authors, but will content myself with the following: Sallust, *B.C.* 28, 1, *introyre ad Ciceronem ac de improviso domi suae* (Cicero's house) *imparatum confodere*;

Cicero, *Cat.* 1, § 32, *desinant insidiari domi suae consuli*; Caesar, *B.C.* 3, 24, *unam ex his quadremem cum remigibus defensoribusque suis ceperunt*; Vergil, *Aen.* 2, 241, *responso repositis Ordine cuncta suo*. Seneca, *Controv.* 9, 24, 13 (p. 249 Bursian), *eum (Thucydidem) Sallustius vicit et in suis eum castris cecidit*. *Suus*, in fact, like *his*, *her*, *its*, or *their own*, may refer to subject or object, according to the context; sometimes even to a person not mentioned in the sentence at all, e.g. Cic. *De Orat.* 3 § 7-8, *is (annus) eius omnem spem . . morte percipit*. *Fuit hoc luctuosum suis* (i.e. amicis eius); Verg. *Aen.* 10, 512, *certior auctor Advolat Aeneae tenui discrimine leti esse suos* (i.e. Aeneae milites).

(4) *Perfect Subjunctive.*—The common aoristic use of this tense is not brought out explicitly enough. It should have been stated clearly that *fuerm* is the subjunctive of *fui*, both in its perfect and its aoristic sense. *Fuit Lucilius comis*, 'Lucilius was polished'; *fuerm Lucilius comis*, 'supposing that he was. *Qualis homo fuit*? 'What sort of a man was he'? *Rogo te, qualis homo fuerit*. And so in *oratio obliqua*, and sentences with *ut* and *quin*.

(5) *Imperfect Subjunctive in conditional sentences referring to past time.*—It is assumed too positively that this so-called imperfect always implies continuous action: (*si viveret, regnaret*; Postgate, § 243). Often it is so, no doubt, but by no means always; to say nothing of Plautus, take the following: Cicero *pro Quinctio*, § 83, *si Alfenus tibi tum satis daret et iudicium accipere vellet, denique omnia quae postulares facere voluisset, quid ageres?* *Revocares eum, quem in Galliam miserat?* *Pro Cluent.* § 61: *quid enim tandem illi iudices responderent, si quis ab illis quaereret, Condemnastis &c.* *Pro Tullio*, § 9; *quod enim usu non veniebat, de eo si quis legem aut iudicium constitueret, non tam prohibere videretur quam admonere.* Horace, 2 *Sat.* 8, 59; *quis esset Finis? ni sapiens sic Nomentanus amicum Tolleret.* Porcius Latro, quoted by Annaeus Seneca, *Contr.* 7. 17. 9 (p. 20, Bursian): *si Antonius iussisset, patrem tuum occideres?* L. Seneca, *Epist.* 36. 7: *si in Parthia natus esset, arcum infans statim tenderet; si in Germania, protinus puer tenerum hastils vibraret. Si aeorum nostrorum temporibus fuisset, equitare et hostem comminus percutere didicisset.* This tense is too often treated as if it always strictly corresponded, on the one hand, to the Latin imperfect indicative, on the other, to the Greek imperfect indicative with *äv*. The fact seems to be that it does not rigidly correspond either to the one or the other, but has some-

times an imperfect, sometimes a pluperfect meaning.

Dr. Kennedy's *Shorter Latin Primer* is, as the Preface says, 'a simple manual for beginners in Latin, preparatory to the use

of the *Revised Latin Primer*.' It contains the memorial part of the Accidence, the elementary parts of the Syntax of the simple sentence, and a short outline of the compound sentence. H. NETTLESHIP.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS EDITION OF THE DIDACHE.

The Teaching of the Apostles newly edited with facsimile text and a commentary for the Johns Hopkins University, by PROF. J. RENDEL HARRIS. London, Cambridge University Press Warehouse: Baltimore, Publication Agency of the Johns Hopkins University. 21s.

THE cordial thanks of scholars are due to the Johns Hopkins University for an excellent facsimile of the text of the *Teaching* with an eclectic commentary by Prof. J. Rendel Harris, formerly Fellow of Clare College. The edition contains a 'description of the Jerusalem Codex'; 'secondary authorities for the text'; notes on 'obscure passages of the *Teaching*,' and on the character, phraseology and integrity of the manual. There are a few clerical errors in the text, which may be corrected without difficulty, but the attempts which have been made to solve its exegetical difficulties by conjectural emendation have been as unsuccessful as they are unnecessary.

CHAPTER I.

By far the most difficult saying of the *Teaching*, in the opinion of the editor, is *ιδρωτάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου μέχρις ἂν γνῶς τίνι δῶς*, on which I have commented in the last number of the Review, p. 262. The words *εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου* are surely not 'merely an equivalent of *ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ σου*' (p. 70), but signify that the man's alms-money must first somehow come into his possession: he must fill his hands (Ps. 129, 7) before he can give, *πληρώσας σέο χεῖρ' ἕλειν ἠρήξοντι παράσχου* (*Phocyl.*), with which compare in the *Sibyllines*, *ιδρώσι σταχίων χερὶ ἠρήξοντι παράσχου* (p. 41). Light is thrown upon the *Teaching* by the parallel passage in *Apost. Const.* vii. 2, *τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου... πᾶσιν οὖν δίκαιον δίδοναι ἐξ οἰκείων πόνων*. Τίμα γάρ φησι τὸν Κύριον ἀπὸ ὧν δικαίων πόνων προτιμητέον δὲ τοῖς ἀγίοις, where *προτιμητέον τοῖς ἀγίοις* is a free version by the later redactor of *μέχρις ἂν γνῶς τίνι δῶς*, and *πόνων* suggests that 'sweat'

in the parallel *ιδρωτάτω* means *labour*, so that a man's alms-money is to be *sudata labore*. As he eats his 'labour' (Ps. 128, 2), so he should also give of his sweat, that is the produce of it. The editor, who sees a contradiction between *πάντι τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου* κ.τ.λ. and *μέχρις ἂν γνῶς τίνι δῶς*, suggests that this clause is a later addition. But, as I explained in the last number, the one saying is for those who have the means and are asked to give; while the other applies to one like the poor widow, who has only two mites, and is therefore not liable to be asked for anything. *Εὐσεβίων μὲν τὸ αἰτοῦντι δίδοναι, εὐσεβεστέρων δὲ καὶ τῷ μὴ αἰτοῦντι* (p. 55). In both respects the second precept goes beyond the first.

CHAPTER X.

Hosanna to the God of David. Bryennius changed *θεῷ* into *νιῷ*, and his emendation has been generally adopted; but Prof. Harris, following Harnack, defends the text (p. 102), quoting a passage from the *Epistle of Barnabas* to the effect that it is an 'error of sinners' to call Christ the son of David, when David calls him Lord (Ps. 110). This would be fairly conclusive if the reading to be defended were 'Lord of David.' To complete the argument, for the sake of brevity I will simply allude to my article in the *Guardian* for the 21st September, 1887, in which the *Theology of the Didaché* is identified with that of Justin Martyr. Justin likewise quotes Ps. 110, and then adds, 'and again in other words, Thy throne O God is for ever and ever' (Ps. 45). Thus we pass from *Κυρίῳ* to *Θεῷ*, which may accordingly be retained as the true reading in default of any evidence to the contrary.

CHAPTER XI.

In the same article, and in the Johns Hopkins edition (pp. 71—74) will be found illustrations of the saying which used to be called the *crua* of the *Διδαχή*, *πᾶς δὲ προφήτης δεδοκιμασμένος ἀληθινὸς ποίων εἰς μυστήριον κοσμικὸν ἐκκλησίας, μὴ διδάσκων δὲ ποιεῖν, ὅσα*

αὐτὸς ποιεῖ οὐ κριθήσεται ἐφ' ἑμῶν μετὰ θεοῦ γὰρ ἔχει τὴν κρίσιν· ὡσαύτως γὰρ ἐποίησαν καὶ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι προφήται.

First omitting the epithet *κοσμικόν*, observe that Justin Martyr gives a clue to the meaning of the saying when he lays down that the Old Testament prophets did things *εἰς μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ* which were not lawful as a rule and for ordinary men. So the Christian prophet was not to be judged of men for abnormal actions performed *εἰς μυστήριον Ἐκκλησίας*. The sense is not altered by the introduction of the epithet, for *μυστήριον* alone implies what *κοσμικόν*, the opposite of *πνευματικόν*, expresses. Like our word 'mystery,' which sometimes means a *mystery-play*, *μυστήριον* is used as a synonym for 'type' or 'symbol,' and signifies an act representing a mystery properly so-called. Thus Justin Martyr in his *Dialogue with Trypho* calls the sawing asunder of Isaiah *μυστήριον καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. A 'mystery' in this sense is necessarily 'cosmic.' The general purport of the passage being thus plain enough, although we do not know historically what actions of the Christian prophet were in the mind of the writer, the various emendations which have been proposed are superfluous. What comes out of this passage and some others is that the *Didaché* interprets the Old Testament in the same mystic way as Justin, Barnabas, and later writers.

CHAPTER XVI.

οἱ δὲ ὑπομείναντες ἐν τῇ πίστει αὐτῶν σωθήσονται ἢ· αὐτοῦ τοῦ καταθέματος, *They that endured in their faith shall be saved by the very curse*. So now Prof. Harris, who formerly preferred the rendering '...from under the curse itself.' But the emphatic *αὐτοῦ* seems to stamp the saying as an expression of the paradox of Salvation by the Curse. The Jews had a saying that God, unlike man, heals the *bitter by the bitter*; and the words 'and I will heal thee of thy wounds' (Jerem. xxx. 17) were taken rabbinically to mean, 'by thy wounds &c.,' by the very curse.

Secondary Authorities for the Text.

Under this head is given an instructive series of extracts from writings down to the 9th century, in which traces of the *Teaching* are found. Its relation to the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd of Hermas* are of especial interest and importance.

HERMAS.—Some parallelisms between the *Shepherd* and the *Teaching* are given, and it is inferred that Hermas was the copyist, the

assumption being first made that he wrote in the latter half of the 2nd century A.D. Others say that the Didachographer was the later writer. What is wanted to decide the question of priority between them is a critical analysis and comparison of the parallel passages in the two writings apart from any preconceived opinion as to the date of either. Consider the passage from Mand. ii. of Hermas:

ἐργάζου τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἐκ τῶν κόπων σου ὧν ὁ θεὸς δίδωσίν σοι πᾶσιν ὑστερουμένοις δίδου ἀπλῶς μὴ δις τὰ ζῶν τίνι δῶς ἢ τίνι μὴ δῶς· πᾶσιν δίδου· πᾶσιν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς δίδωσθαι θέλει ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων δορημάτων. οἱ οὖν λαμβάνοντες ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ θεῷ διὰ τὸ ἔλαβον καὶ εἰς τί· οἱ μὲν γὰρ λαμβάνοντες θλιβόμενοι οὐ δικαιοῦνται οἱ δὲ ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβάνοντες τίσουσιν δίκην. ὁ οὖν δίδους ἀθῶς ἐστίν· ὡς γὰρ ἔλαβεν παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου τὴν διακονίαν τελέσαι ἀπλῶς αὐτὴν ἐτέλεσεν μηδὲν διακρίνων τίνι δῶ ἢ μὴ δῶ.

In this, as I have said elsewhere, he 'amalgamates the contrasted precepts of our first chapter, and adds a warning against hesitation from the fourth.' In justification of this statement I would call attention especially to the words *υστερουμένοις* and *διστάζων*. Omit *υστερουμένοις*, and the passage has the clear and consistent sense, 'Give to all indiscriminately, throwing the responsibility of receiving unworthily upon the receiver'; which is also the meaning of the saying, *Give to every one &c.*, in chap. i. of the *Didaché*. As a correction to this too absolute precept, Hermas inserts the word *υστερουμένοις*, and says in effect, 'Give to all that need, for God wills that we should give to all whether they need or not.' This incongruity goes far to decide the claim to originality against Hermas.

Next consider the word *διστάζων*. This may be shown to have been taken from the precept of the *Didaché*, οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι· οὐδὲ δίδους γογγύσεις· γνώση γὰρ τίς ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ μισθοῦ καλὸς ἀνταποδότης (chap. iv.), which is also found in (and is doubtless older than) the *Epistle of Barnabas*. That Hermas was acquainted with it follows independently from the passages:

Simil. ii., ὅταν οὖν ἀναφθῇ ὁ πλούσιος ἐπὶ τὸν πένητα καὶ χορηγήσῃ αὐτῷ τὰ δέοντα, πιστεύων ὅτι ὁ ἐργάσεται εἰς τὸν πένητα δυνήσεται τὸν μισθὸν εἰρεῖν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ... ἐπιχορηγεῖ οὖν ὁ πλούσιος τῷ πένητι πάντα ἀδιστακτικῶς.

Simil. ix. 24., καὶ ἐκ τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐχορηγήσαν· ἀνονειδίστως καὶ ἀδιστακτικῶς. ὁ οὖν κύριος ἰδὼν τὴν ἀπλότητα αὐτῶν καὶ πᾶσαν νηπιότητα ἐπλήθυνεν αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ.

Under the influence perhaps of James i. 5, he recalls the saying of the *Teaching* in the form:

οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι οὐδὲ δίδους ὀνειδίσεις,
γνώσῃ γὰρ τίς ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ μίσθου καλὸς ἀνταπο-
δότης.

We can now account for the origin of the passage quoted above from *Mand.* ii. as a farrago of the three sayings of the *Didaché* πάντι τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου κ.τ.λ., ἰδρωτάτω... μέχρῃς ἂν γνῶς τίνι δῶς, οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι κ.τ.λ. He takes the words τίνι δῶς out of their proper connexion, and compensates for the omission of the complete clause μέχρῃς ἂν γνῶς τίνι δῶς by the interpolation of ὑστερουμένων, as Bryennius saw when he wrote his note on that clause, οἷτω φαίνεται διδάσκων καὶ Ἑρμᾶς, πᾶσι τοῖς ὑστερουμένοις διδόναι λέγων. Lastly, if τίνι δῶς in *Hermas* points to the end of the saying 'Let thine alms sweat &c,' what has become of the beginning of it, ἰδρωτάτω κ.τ.λ.? We are again led to the conclusion that the 'sweat' to be bestowed as alms is the produce of toil, from his use of the expression ἐκ τῶν κόπων σου in *Mand.* ii. and elsewhere. He may or may not have been thinking at the same time of some other saying on the duty of labouring to have to give, like Eph. iv. 28. If *Hermas* knew chap. i. of the *Teaching* in its entirety, he probably knew the whole tract substantially as it has come down to us.

BARNABAS.—In the matter of the Two Ways the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Teaching* may have drawn from a common source dealing with that subject only; but some think that he copied from the *Teaching*, and knew the whole of it. Very much depends on the comparison of his fourth chapter with chap. xvi. of the *Teaching*. He writes:

διὸ προσέχωμεν ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις.
οὐδὲν γὰρ ὠφελήσει ὑμᾶς ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς
ζωῆς ἡμῶν καὶ τῆς πίστεως ἐὰν μὴ
νῦν ἐν τῷ ἀνόμῳ καιρῷ καὶ τοῖς μέλλοντιν σκαν-
δάλοις, ὥς πρέπει νῦν τοῖς θεοῦ, ἀντι-
στῶμεν, ἵνα μὴ σχῇ παρείσδυσιν ὁ μέλας.
φύγωμεν ἀπὸ πάσης ματαιότητος, μισήσωμεν
τελειῶς τὰ ἔργα τῆς πονηρίας ὁδοῦ. μὴ καθ'
ἐαυτοὺς ἐνδύνοντες μονάζετε ὡς ἦδη δικαιωμένοι,
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνερχόμενοι συνζη-
τεῖτε περὶ τοῦ κοινῆ συμφέροντος.

Throughout the chapter he seems to have a confused recollection of different parts of the *Two Ways* and of the passage from the last chapter of the *Teaching*:

γρηγορεῖτε ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν... οὐ γὰρ
οἶδατε τὴν ὥραν ἐν ᾗ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἔρχεται
πικνὸς δὲ συναχθήσεται ζητούντες τὰ ἀνηκόντα
ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν οὐ γὰρ ὠφελήσει ὑμᾶς ὁ πᾶς

χρόνος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν ἐὰν μὴ ἐν
τῷ ἐσχάτῳ καιρῷ τελειώθητε· ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἐσχά-
ταις ἡμέραις κ.τ.λ. καὶ τότε φανήσεται ὁ κοσμο-
πλανῆς (sic) ὡς νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ποιήσει
σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα κ.τ.λ.

Instead of *Keep-continual-vigil for your life* in preparation for 'the last days,' he writes προσέχωμεν ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, and near the end of the chapter, μήποτε ἐπικαθυπνώσωμεν. The τῆς ζωῆς which was omitted in its place comes in soon after in the phrase, ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν καὶ τῆς πίστεως, if this be the true reading (p. 55). His ὡς νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ may have been suggested by the ὡς νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ of the *Teaching*, and the like may be said of the σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα of which he speaks at the end of the chapter. In all this context he may have been drawing from the conclusion of the *Teaching*, and at the same time from other parts of it. The converse hypothesis is easily seen to be untenable.

It should not be overlooked that in chap. xix. of the *Epistle of Barnabas* there is a reading, οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι οὐδὲ δίδους γογγύσεις, πάντι τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, which agrees curiously with the words of *Hermas* in *Mand.* ii., μὴ διστάζων τίνι δῶς ἢ τίνι μὴ δῶς· πᾶσιν δίδου. It used to be assumed that this πάντι τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου was an interpolation from the Gospel, but it may have been taken from chap. i. of the *Teaching*.

The Titles of the Teaching and its Date.

It is commonly said that the *Teaching* has two superscriptions, whereas according to the manuscript it has only the one, διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, the second 'title' being written as part of the manual itself, of which the first line runs thus, Διδαχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν· ὁδοὶ δύο. Compare in *Eccl.* i. 1, 'The words of the Preacher'; and at the beginning of *St. Mark's Gospel*, Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The longer title is therefore the more authentic. Clear traces of it are found in the *Apostolical Constitutions*; and it was perhaps known to *Barnabas*, who calls the precepts of the Two Ways δικαιώματα Κυρίου (chap. xxi.). Possibly it underlies also the saying of *Hermas* in *Simil.* ix. 17, τὰ ὅρη ταῦτα τὰ δώδεκα δώδεκα φυλαὶ εἰσιν αἱ κατοικοῦσαι ὅλον τὸν κόσμον. ἐκνήχθη οὖν εἰς ταύτας ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων. Compare in the Gospel the saying that the apostles should sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. *Hermas* explains his φυλαὶ by ἔθνη. Thus he says virtually that Christ was preached to the twelve nations of the

world διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, the peculiar number twelve assigned to the nations being suggested perhaps by the διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων of the *Teaching*. According to the *Ecclesiastical Canons of the Holy Apostles* founded upon the Διδαχή, the twelve Apostles were commanded ἐκτέμψασθαι τοὺς λόγους εἰς ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην, that is to say to teach them [πᾶσι] τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, and for that purpose the world was divided into ἐπαρχίαι according to their number. In the Greek there is apparently a hiatus at πρὸ τοῦ. Μέλλετε κληροῦσθαι τὰς ἐπαρχίας, but the Coptic version reads, 'He enjoined us, saying (whereas we had not yet divided the countries among us), Ye shall divide them among you so that each one may take his place according to your number.' Compare in chap. viii. of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, οὖσιν δεκαδύο εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν φυλῶν κ.τ.λ. εἰς τὸ κηρύσσειν.

It is strange that a tract which styles itself Διδαχή τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (line 1) should proceed in this fashion (line 9), οὐκ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς. The inference is that there is an interpolation in chap. i., and that the first recension of the Two Ways was somewhat shorter than that which has come down to us. It seems to follow also that it must at first have existed or been written down separately, since the following chapters of the *Teaching* do not appear to have been addressed τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. These main questions in the criticism of the Διδαχή are thus seen to be suggested by the title itself. If it be the case that there was a separate short recension of the Two Ways before the Διδαχή as we know it, it may be assumed that the earlier tract was known to Barnabas and Hermas. The entire Διδαχή was probably used by Hermas (who may have written about 150 A.D. or earlier), but it is harder to say how much of it was known to Barnabas. If it be inferred from his fourth chapter that he knew the latter part of the *Teaching*, it remains to account for his apparent or alleged want of acquaintance with the matter characteristic of the long

recension of the Two Ways. Suffice it here to remark (1) that if the reading in his nineteenth chapter mentioned above should prove to be the true one he may have known the long recension, and (2) that if he had known it we may be sure that he would not have quoted the part containing the words, οὐκ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; since he was an anti-Jewish writer addressing Gentile Christians. Be this as it may, there is no positive proof on the other hand that the Διδαχή is later than Barnabas, or that it may not be practically a work of about 100 A.D. or earlier, at whatever date it was first completely reduced from the oral to the written form. An earlier copy than that of 1056 A.D. discovered by Bryennius might of course shew textual variations, and particular clauses might be found to be of late origin, like the δευτέρα δὲ ἐντολή τῆς διδαχῆς of chap. ii., which is not found in *Apost. Const.* vii. 3; but the manual seems to be in substance older than any patristic writing with which we can compare it.

On the minor clerical errors and peculiarities of the manuscript see pp. 12, 13, &c. On p. 62, but not on p. 10, we read οἱ δὲ (sic) ὑπομεινάντες. Prof. Harris favours the insertion of οὗς δὲ ἐλέγσεις in chap. ii. (p. 104); but the threefold classification of the text, οὗς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, περὶ ὧν δὲ προσεύξῃ, οὗς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχὴν σου, is complete in itself, and the external evidence for the addition is inconclusive. The writer of the *Epistle of Jude* may or may not have been acquainted with the precepts of the *Teaching*, but his expression ἐάντοὺς ποιμαίνοντες does not help us much, since it may be referred immediately to Ezek. xxxiv. The parallel in 2 Pet. ii. 13 would seem to have the better claim to priority, if it is to be interpreted with reference to the saying that a prophet ὀρίζων τράπεζαν must not eat of it. The Hebrew in note 1, p. 80, is inaccurately printed.

This edition of the text should be in the hands of all students of the *Didaché*.

C. TAYLOR.

Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel in ihrem Verhältniss zum neutestamentlichen Schriftthum. Eine Untersuchung von G. WOHLBERG. Erlangen: Deichert. London: Nutt. 1888. 2 Mk.

WOHLBERG maintains that the author of 'the Teaching of the Apostles' was acquainted with a written gospel, and that the passages XV. 3. 4, where he enjoins his readers to offer up 'prayers and alms and to do all things ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ,' must refer to a written record, and not, as Sabatier and

Lechler thought, to some oral tradition. The gospel on which the author drew was in the first instance that according to St. Matthew (p. 11), and the chapters of which he availed himself principally are V-VII., X, XXIV. (p. 47). Of St. Luke's gospel Wohlenberg finds only two clear traces in the 'Teaching,' viz. 1. 3. sq., comp. Luke VI. 27-35, and XVI. 1, comp. Luke XII. 35. Of these two passages only the first appears to us quite conclusive. Nor do we think that great stress can be laid on the collateral evidence derived from a comparison of IV. 8, where the catechumen is enjoined συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ

πάντα τῇ ἀδελφῇ σου καὶ οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἴδιον εἶναι, with Acts IV. 32, where it is said of the Christians οὐδὲ εἰς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι etc. That passages from the text of Matthew (and Luke) are found in the 'Teaching' is evident and cannot be denied; but the additions and alterations which are introduced in the latter, as well as the manner in which the quotations are joined together, give rise to several questions; we cannot say that any of them have in this treatise been brought nearer their solution. We read for instance I. 2 πρῶτον ἀγαπήσεις τὸν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε. The last words are not added by the author of the 'Teaching' (p. 20); they are most probably taken by him from Sirach VII. 30. Again I. 3-4, when quoting (Luke VI. 39) ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπήτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς, he adds καὶ οὐχ ἔχετε ἐχθρόν: quoting (Matt. V. 39) ἐάν τις σοὶ δῇ ῥάπισμα etc., he adds καὶ ἔσθ' τέλειος: quoting (Luke VI. 30) ἐὰν λάβῃ τις ἀπὸ σοῦ τὸ σὺν, μὴ ἀπαίτει, he adds οὐδὲ γὰρ δύνασαι. These additions, as well as the clause νηστεύετε δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν δικούντων ὑμῖν, point to a record of the Sermon on the Mount partly different from that contained in the canonical gospels.

Wohlenberg however rejects the hypothesis that the author had any other gospel or synopsis of gospels, e.g. the Ev. sec. Aegyptios or sec. Hebraeos (p. 52, sq.) before him; his own belief is that the author, in quoting the canonical gospels from memory, allowed himself no more than the liberty which was common to the christian writers of his time (p. 55). The passages in the 'Teaching' however bear a striking resemblance to Tatian's *Diatessaron*, both as regards their arrangement and their wording, which Wohlenberg himself admits (p. 51), and which he illustrates in his synoptical tables (pp. 23, 26, 35). By refusing to accept an earlier synopsis which formed the ground-work both of the 'Teaching' and of Tatian, he leaves this resemblance practically unexplained. The relationship which the eucharistic prayers, chaps. IX. and X., bear to the gospel of St. John, as well as their likeness to the earliest prayers of the Christian congregation recorded in Acts IV., are fully shown (pp. 56, 71, sq.). But the opinion which Wohlenberg expresses (p. 85), that the 'Teaching' furnishes most important and hitherto unknown evidences of the historicity of the fourth Gospel, is curiously modified by the conclusion at which he arrives (p. 92), that its 'author may possibly have known the writings of St. John, but that he was not intimately acquainted with them as he was with the synoptists, nor did he make any use of them.' The view of Zahn, that these prayers are not eucharistic in the stricter sense, but that they were offered up at the close of the Agape, is fully endorsed (p. 77), but the serious objections which have been urged against it (comp. Funk, *Doctrina Duodecim Apostol.*, p. 26) remain partly unnoticed. The manner in which Wohlenberg has examined the allusions to the Pauline epistles, supposed to exist in the 'Teaching,' (p. 87, sq.), seems to us quite correct, and his conclusion, that there is no distinct evidence of its author having been acquainted with any other books of the New Testament besides those referred to above, appears well founded.

CHARLES MERK.

Griechische Mythologie, von L. PRELLER: vierte Auflage, von CARL ROBERT: Bd. I. erste Hälfte. 5 Mk.

The appearance of a fourth edition of Preller's work shows that a steady demand for it exists, and this is the most conclusive proof of its value. At the same

time one was more struck in the preceding edition with its inadequacy to the advance of the study than with any other quality, except its general handiness as a book of reference. The present edition gives us a much more thorough revision, alteration, and enlargement of the third edition than the third did of its predecessor. 428 pages now correspond to 349 pages in the last edition. The changes which Prof. Robert has introduced are of various kinds. (1) He frequently eliminates the naturalistic origin which Preller assigned to Greek gods, e.g. on p. 170 the lordship of Hera over sun, moon, and stars has disappeared entirely, whereas Plew in Ed. III. disputed it in a foot-note: on p. 336 the stormy scenes between Zeus and Hera, a picture of the heaven disturbed by stormy weather, have been ejected from the text. So in many places slight omissions or changes have got rid of the most violent naturalistic explanations. The process might have been carried even further with advantage. (2) The history of the artistic representation of each deity is given far more completely, clearly, and methodically, yet with admirable brevity. A good example may be found by comparing pp. 333-5 with pp. 261-2 of the preceding edition. (3) Many notes and passages are re-written with much fuller knowledge, more plentiful references to the modern literature of the subject, and a different point of view. The passage relating to the Sibyls is entirely remodelled, and a long note added, showing among other things that originally there was only one Sibyl. The probability that the Sibyls were in part historical personages is admitted even into the text. The Asiatic origin of the idea is retained and made more precise, the Erythraean Sibyl being explained as probably meant by Heraclitus, Plato, &c., when they speak of a Sibyl. (4) The practical recognition of the principle that cultus is not subject to the variation which continually altered mythology, that it preserves antique usage, and should therefore be taken as the guide in studying mythology wherever it is possible, is one of the most important changes which distinguish recent mythological investigation; and Prof. Robert has added throughout the book numerous details of local cults, and especially those of Asia Minor. The importance of the Asia Minor religion for the history of Greek religion is coming steadily into recognition. An interesting point is that the native Greek goddess of love has disappeared from the fourth edition. Even the third edition was quite certain that the Greeks worshipped a goddess akin to Venus and to Freya before they came into contact with Oriental religion. But Prof. Robert, who has often been content to modify Preller's certainty into probability, here leaves no doubt that Aphrodite is wholly derived from the Syrian, Phoenician, and Canaanite. The change may cause regret to some, but we welcome it as a marked step in advance. There is still room for much more rigorous application of the historical method. The mythopoetic power continued fresh throughout Greek history: and the old myths were constantly liable to change under the pressure of historical or literary conditions. The makers of every great political or social change sought a justification in ancient legend, and were always able to find it. The Aetolian conquerors of Elis, the Dorian in the Peloponnesus, justified their conquest by myths of the expulsion of their leader's ancestors from the country. A very charming example of this kind of myth in a humbler sphere is given in Wilamowitz-Möllendorff's *Ieyllos*, excursus on *Ἰάκωv γοῦαλ*, though Bornemann is not convinced by it. The genesis of any legend can never be assumed as early until its age is proved. But if Prof. Robert had applied this method throughout the book in

the same way that he has done in his own papers on mythological and religious subjects, he would have produced, not a new edition, but a new work. On the whole the changes introduced leave undisturbed the good qualities which have made Preller's work so popular, while they have eliminated many of its faults in detail, and have immensely improved its general tone and trustworthiness.

W. M. RAMSAY.

Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sage und Kunst. By MAXIMILIAN MAYER. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1887. 10 Mk.

THIS book is of about 400 pages and intends to be a contribution to the study of Greek religion and to Greek archaeology. Throughout there is much learning, and in the first part some ingenuity—often paradoxical enough. But on both sides the main result is unsatisfactory, chiefly because of the writer's incapacity for clear statement or clear argument, and in the first part also because of the narrow range of his hypotheses, which are chiefly solar. In his first chapter on the giants he is more or less successful in expounding the myth; he rightly emphasises their human aspect, which is perhaps their earliest: they are to be regarded—as has been elsewhere pointed out—as *αἰρωχόβρες γίγαντες*, as the quasi-human generally lawless figures of a faded past, being, as he dexterously suggests, the same as Hesiod's bronze race. But he does not call attention sufficiently to their other character as elemental forces, which they undoubtedly bear in certain localities. When we come to his explanation of the character and myth of the Titans we find more unproved conclusions and more instances of unskilful and unreal argumentation than can be mentioned in a short notice. Showing little feeling for the popular mythopoeic mind, he makes an unreal distinction between the 'Volks-glaube' and 'die nach dem Ursprung der Dinge forschende Speculation'—unreal, because the 'Volks-glaube' in most parts of the world is full of speculations on the origin of things. He maintains then that the Greeks never had any chief god but Zeus, and that 'the whole idea of an earlier pre-Olympian world had no firm ground in the people's belief.' That the name Zeus is as old as the Hellenic people may be granted, and also that in the national cultus there never existed any other cycle of divinities organised under a supreme god except the Olympian; but we may still believe that in pre-Homeric times at least there were many localities that in their worship cared less for Zeus or for any 'Haupt-Gott,' and more for the local Demeter or Artemis or Asclepius, or 'Aegaeon': that in fact there was a 'pre-Olympian' stage but no 'pre-Olympian' systematic theology. We may object then to his method of explaining all the shadowy personages of the Titanic world as so many 'Hypostasen' of Zeus, Poseidon, or Helios. For instance there is evidence of an early local worship of Briareus-Aegaeon in Euboea; and in late authors like Callimachus (certainly not, as he supposes, in Euripides' *Alkestis*) Poseidon is himself called 'Aegaeon.' He argues then that in the earliest days also Aegaeon was a mere title of Poseidon, which then became detached from him and 'hypostasised,' and as an independent divinity became worshipped in Euboea. Is it not rather, to say the least, as probable that the cult and name of Poseidon here is not the earlier but the later, that Briareus-Aegaeon at Euboea was the cruder and more barbaric figure, a mere personification of the element, displaced afterwards by Poseidon who then occasionally assumes his name, as in other cases it may be that the

Olympians assume the name of their dethroned predecessors? His theory about 'Hypostasen,' that an adjective sometimes becomes a substantive and then a person, will hold good for certain developments in Greek religion; but he applies it extravagantly when he tries to prove that Atlas, Prometheus, Bellerophon, Ixion, and Endymion (!) are all aspects and forms of the sun-god: and this new application of a time-honoured theory is not made plausible without certain misquotations, or wrong estimates of passages. He seems to take as a general axiom that the many may be resolved back into one; originally there is one Cyclops, not many Cyclopes, one Erinyes, not many Erinyes, &c. This may hold good of Cyclops, but certainly not of the Erinyes: each case must be tried by itself; and the counter-axiom also prevails in Greek religion. And the one into which the many are resolved by Dr. Mayer is too often Zeus: thus Cyclops becomes Zeus Cyclops, that is, Zeus Triops, the three-eyed god, and Dr. Mayer in a foot-note disclaims any connection with those who might object that the Cyclops had only one eye: he curiously argues that though we only hear of his one eye he must have had three, else his face would have been a deformity.

Much of his theorising is occupied with the philological analysis of names, and this is very irritating when the writer is not a professed comparative philologist. Dr. Mayer skirmishes on the ground in amateur fashion, as one might in the old days when vowels did not matter. Neither his philological nor his other exposition suffices to prove his main point, that 'Titan' is the name of a supreme god, a Zeus-Helios, nor to reconcile us to the theory—which all this seems to imply—that later Greek polytheism emanates from a quasi-monotheism—a theory devout perhaps but dangerous. As against Dr. Mayer it might be maintained that Titan in the ancient texts is proved to be the characteristic appellative of many gods, not the personal name of one, and that it connotes a figure generally divine of the earlier half-remembered period of religion. It was the disappearance of the older cults and titles that may well have given rise to the legend of the Titanomachy, which Dr. Mayer in vain strives to prove to be a contest with the wild forces of nature.

Generally, Dr. Mayer's mythological theorising has many weaknesses: he emphasises contradictions which were nothing in the ancient mythopoeic mind: he takes slight verbal connections of names as proving identity of things and persons; and he would crystallise into hard substance what is floating, vague and half-formed.

The archaeological part of his book is a valuable compendium of the various monuments that refer to the gigantomachy, and he has omitted little. There is very little discussion of general questions—for instance of the important question, to what influences was due the changed form in which the giants come to be represented. His remarks on the larger monuments of sculpture are not of first-hand value. As regards the slabs from the altar at Pergamon he has nothing important to say that is new, and he shows little skill or intuition in his estimate of the Pergamene style. L. R. F.

De Pontificum Romanorum inde ab Augusto usque ad Aurelium condicione publica.
By PAULUS HABEL (Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen).

THIS is an able and interesting monograph intended to supplement for imperial times the treatise of C. Bardi which dealt only with the republican epoch. Not the least useful part of the essay is the complete

list given at the commencement of all those, both emperors and private individuals, who are known from inscriptions, coins or authors to have belonged to the college of pontiffs. That much of the information which Dr. Habel has so laboriously collected was known before it is needless to say, but there are several points in which he differs from the received authorities. Among these we can only mention the following: (1) Whereas Borghesi, Mommsen, Henzen, &c. hold that the election to the pontificatus maximus was transferred in 14 A.D. along with the other elections from the comitia of the septemdecim tribus to the senate, Dr. Habel maintains that the election by the tribes was retained up to the time of Severus. The reasons for this view we cannot enter into here, but they seem, if not absolutely convincing, to make it at least probable. (2) It is shown, I think convincingly, that up to the time of Vespasian nomination to a pontificatus was never accorded to more than one of the imperial family at the same time, and that this nomination played an important part in the quasi-designation of the successor to the empire (Tac. *Ann.* i. 3, Suet. *Calig.* 12, Dio Cass. lvi. 8, &c.). (3) With regard to the pontificatus granted to private individuals, it is generally held that they were transferred along with the ordinary magistracies from the comitia to the senate, and that the emperor could only appoint by his right of commendatio. Dr. Habel somewhat arbitrarily rejects this view, and affirms that from the year 29 B.C. the emperors had made these appointments 'legitime ex sua potestate.' No sufficient reason is given for this departure from the common view, and the passages cited by Mommsen (Tac. *Ann.* iii. 19, Dio Cass. liii. 17) are not satisfactorily explained away. There are several other minor points on which fresh light is thrown, such as the meaning to be assigned to the legend 'Pietas Augusti' on coins of the second century, while there is a somewhat minute discussion as to the symbols of the various sacerdotia occurring on coins.

E. G. HARDY.

Society in Rome under the Caesars. By W. R. INGE. Murray. 6s.

THERE is nothing about this little book which calls for special notice. It was the essay which obtained

the Hare Prize at Cambridge in 1886, and though a distinctly good and well-written prize essay, we are not sure that it so far exceeds, except perhaps in length, other productions of its class as to warrant publication. At any rate it must be ranked far below Arnold's *Roman Provincial Administration*, which gained a similar prize at Oxford some years ago. The best two chapters in the book are those on Roman Religion and Morality, in which the chief points, familiar enough in themselves, are well and sometimes strikingly stated. The rest of the book, in spite of a long list of authorities referred to, has been mostly pieced together from Becker's *Gallus* and Friedländer's *Sittengeschichte*, under such heads as Grades of Society, Education and Marriage, Daily Life, Amusements, &c. As a published work it is apparently intended for popular reading, and this no doubt makes the vagueness of much of the book, and the almost complete absence of references less of a drawback. As a matter of curiosity however we should be glad to learn the authority for the statement that senators 'might dine in the Capitol at the public expense'; it would also be interesting to know where Mr. Inge has discovered the improper epigrams 'of the virtuous and refined Pliny' which he says have come down to us. That Pliny did write 'hendecasyllabi' which were not quite proper we know from his own statement, but the hexameters which have come down to us (*Ep.* vii. 4) merely relate to a questionable epigram of the virtuous and refined Cicero.

E. G. H.

Kritisch-exegetische Studien zu den scriptores historiae Augustae. By DR. RUDOLF BITSCHOFFSKY.

THIS pamphlet contains the critical examination of a number of difficult and corrupt passages. The criticism is exercised mostly with judgment and caution; in many cases the traditional reading is successfully vindicated, and either in this way or by a slight alteration of the text several difficult passages seem to be successfully cleared up.

E. G. H.

METRICAL INSCRIPTION FROM LAGINA.

THE following inscription from Lagina, in Caria, was published by MM. Charles Diehl and Georges Cousin in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*

of the present year (xi. pp. 160 foll.) from a copy and an impression taken by themselves, and a copy of M. Benndorf:—

..... AT
 ΣΗΣΙΕΡΗΣ ΑΙΔΙΜΟΕΝΤΙΠΟΘΩΙ
 ΟΥΓΑΡΜΟΙΠΛΟΥΤΟΙΟΜΕΓΑ . Θ . ΟΣΑΜΦΙΜΕΜΥΚΕΝ
 ΔΩΜΑΠΕΡΙΣΤΙΛΠΝΑΙΣΛΑΜΠΟΜΕΝΟΝΣΤΑΜΙΣΙΝ
 5 Ο . ΔΕΠΡΟΘΥΜΙΗΣΤΕΑΣΑΝΤΟΣΟΝ . . . ΟΝΑΡΕΤΗ
 ΕΥΣΕΒΙΗΝΙΕΡΗΝΕΣΤΕΛΟΣΕΙΡΓΑΣΑΤΟ
 ΠΑΝΤΑΔΕΣΕΙΟΘΥΡΟΣΟΣΟΝΣΘΕΝΟΣΑΧΗΝΕΣΣΙΝ
 ΕΛΛΑΧΕΝΕΜΜΕΝΕΩΣΟΜΠΝΙΑΚΥΔΑΛΙΜΗ
 ΚΑΙΤΕΣΟΙΑΡΗΤΕΙΡΑΝΕΜΗΝΑΛΟΧΟΝΜΕΝΕΘΗΚΑ
 10 ΜΟΣΧΙΟΝΕΞΑΣΙΗΣΗΓΕΝΟΣΕΣΤΙΦΙΛΟΝ

NO. XIX. VOL. II.

U

ΚΛΩΔΙΑΝΗΝΔΕΠΙΟΙΚΛΗΔΟΥΧΟΝΠΑΙΔΕΡΑΤΕΙΝΗΝ
 ΚΛΗΙΔΟΣΡΑΔΙΝΙΙΣΧΕΡΣΙΝΕΦΑΠΤΟΜΕΝΗΝ
 ΟΠΠΟΣΑΔΕΝΔΑΙΤΗΣΙΚΑΙΕΙΛΑΠΙΝΗΣΙΝΕΡΕΞΑ
 ΟΙΔΕΠΑΤΡΗΣΓΛΥΚΕΡΗΣΠΟΛΛΑΚΙΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΗ
 15 . . . ΤΑΔΕΡΕ . ΑΣΑΜΟΙΣΘΕΝΟΣΩΠΑΣΕΝΟΙΑΛΙΠΕΡΝΗΣ
 . . ΜΑΣΕΚΑΙΤΩΝΣ . ΔΑΙΜΟΝΑΠ . ΕΙΟΙΙΗΝΗΝ
 ΚΑΙΡΟΙΟ Ο ΤΕ
 Α . ΣΠΑΛΛ

The editors, in their cursive transcript, have made only a very slight and unsuccessful attempt to restore the text, although the poem is pretty enough to be

worth making out. It is incomplete at the beginning and end; but the surviving lines read evidently as follows:—

. ατ . . .
 σῆς ἱερῆς [τιμῆς φ]αἰδιμόεντι πόθῳ.
 Οὐ γὰρ μοι πλούτοιο μεγά[ν]ο[ρ]ος ἀμφιμέμικεν
 δῶμα περί στυλῖναις λαμπόμενον σταμῖσιν.
 5 ο[ὐ]δὲ προθυμῇ σ(π)ε(ύ)σαντος δ(μ)[όφρ]ονα βέ(ζει)[ν]
 εὐσεβίην ἱερῇν ἐς τέλος εἰργάσατο.

 πάντα δε σείο θυωρός, ὅσον σθένος ἀχήμεσον,
 ἔλλαχεν ἐμμένως, Ὀμπνια κυδαλία.
 καὶ τέ σοι ἀρήτειραν ἐμὴν ἄλοχον μὲν ἔθηκα
 10 Μόσχιον, ἐξ Ἀσίης ἡ γένος ἐστὶ φίλον.
 Κλωδιανὴν δ' ἐπὶ οἱ κληδοῦχον παῖδ' ἑρατεινὴν
 κληῖδος ῥαδιν(α)ῖς χερσὶν ἐφαπτομένην.
 ὅπποσα δ' ἐν δαίτησι καὶ εἰλαπίνῃσιν ἔρεξα
 οἶδε πάτρης γλυκερῆς πολλὰκι μαρτυρίῃ.
 15 πάν[τ]α δ' ἔρε[ξ]α [δ]σα μοι σθένος ὥπασεν οἷα λιπερνῆς,
 ναί[] μά σε καὶ τ(ή)ν σ[οι] δαίμονα πει(θ)ο(μέ)νην.
 . . . καίροιο ο τε
 α . σπαλα

In line 3 we have an echo of the opening of Pindar's first Olympian ode, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ | ἔτε διαπρίπτει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου—, and of Homer's description of Circe's palace filled with her singing (*Od.* x. 227): δάπεδον ἅπαν ἀμφιμέμικεν. Ὀμπνια in line 8 is Hecate, whose temple at Lagina was very famous. It will be observed that the dialect is Ionic throughout. The date of the poem is hard to guess; but the name Κλωδιανή points to the first Christian century at the earliest. A translation is often the best of commentaries, and therefore I append one here:—

—“with singular desire for thy holy worship.
 For around me echoes no palace of splendid wealth,

gleaming with polished columns all about; nor could my zeal, when I strove to do (or ‘offer’) what my heart desired, carry my pious devotion into effect. Yet thy priest, so far as we poor had power, received all dues unfaithfully, thou glorious Omphnia. Yea and I gave thee as priestess my wife Moschion, who is a dear daughter of Asia; and Clodiana beside her, my sweet child, as thy key-bearer, grasping thy key with slender hands. And how great things I did in banquets and feasting, the record of my dear fatherland knows full oft. Yea, all things have I done, for a poor man, to the best of my power, so help me thou and the goddess that obeys thy will (*i.e.* Demeter and Persephone)—”
 E. L. Hicks.

NOTES.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE SOLONIAN LEGISLATION.—Mr. Case's reference to ‘the papyrus found on an Egyptian mummy, and now deposited at Berlin’ is unpardonably vague, and inaccurate as well. The papyrus in question was not found on a mummy. It is No. 163 in the Berlin collection, and is engraved in the *Abhandlungen* of the Berlin Academy for 1885. Mr. Case speaks of the ‘revolution against the Eupatrid monopoly of archonship, described in the papyrus at Berlin.’ The papyrus, however, does not describe anything of the kind; but simply states as a fact (*col. I. b. ll. 7—9*) that of the nine archons in the year after Damasias, only four were Eupatrids.

This clearly pre-supposes the Solonian Legislation; for the effect of that legislation was, as Mr. Grote puts it, that the poor Eupatrids became ineligible, while rich men not Eupatrids were admitted; and not, as Mr. Case apparently implies, that the Eupatrids generally became ineligible.

Mr. Case cites three Greek authors in support of his theory: namely, Plutarch, *Solon*, 16; Demosthenes, *de fals. leg.* p. 420; and Herodotus, ii. 177. To make the first passage support the theory, one must translate the word *ταχύ* by the words ‘five and twenty years afterwards.’ The second passage does not ‘place the era of Solon in 583,’ but implies that

he was dead by that time. The third passage refers to an isolated law, and cannot be connected with Solon's general legislation.

Mr. Case states that 'by a general agreement of Greek and Egyptian sources, the accession of Amasis took place about 570': but Dr. Wiedemann (*Ägyptische Geschichte* pp. 602, ff.) shows that it took place in 564.

CECIL TORR.

* *

A CORRECTION.—In a notice of the third edition of Köpke's *Cicero pro Plancio*, as revised by Dr. G. Landgraf, the writer, Mr. W. Y. Fausset, inadvertently attributes to me a statement for which I am not responsible. He says 'In § 90 *impiorum* is rightly referred (by Landgraf) to Clodius and his gang, not (as by Holden) to Catiline.' My note on the passage in both editions (1881 and 1883) is '*illorum impiorum*, "those enemies of their country," the Clodian party.' There is not a word about Catiline in the note. Again Landgraf's adoption of the readings *præferam* and *arcum* in §§ 77 and 95, respectively is spoken of as if all previous editions had retained the ordinary readings *præ me feram* and *arcum*. In both of my editions each of the readings will be found, the former supported by nearly the same evidence as that adduced by Dr. Landgraf, the latter attributed to its original proposer—Cobet. Mr. Fausset must have had my edition before him when he wrote his article; it is therefore surprising that so careful and scrupulous a scholar, as his edition of the *Cluentiana* shows him to be, should not have made better use of it.

H. A. HOLDEN.

[I REGRET that I did not state my criticism of Dr. Holden's treatment of *Plan.* § 90 more carefully: he has cause for complaint. Re-stated, my objection will appear to have been not entirely reckless. After rightly referring '*impiorum*' to 'the Clodian party,' he goes on to refer words in the same connexion, viz. '*peremptum cæset mea morte id exemplum*,' to the Catilinarian epoch. 'Cic. means that, had he died before his defeat of the conspiracy of Catiline, the precedent would have been lost for a vigorous exercise of power on the part of the senate and people in recalling him.' This was what I had in my mind: that Dr. Holden here virtually contradicts his own note on '*impiorum*.' Surely there is no thought of Catiline until the following sentence '*an si umquam*' cet.

As to the readings in §§ 77, 95, my immediate object was to point out where I thought Landgraf had improved on the text of C. F. W. Müller. I made no assertion with regard to the readings adopted by Dr. Holden. In § 77 I spoke of 'others' reading *præ me feram*, not 'all others' nor 'edd. cet.,' as I had done in noting the reading *tu* (§ 40). In § 95, I am sorry if I seem to have given Landgraf credit for the emendation *arcum*: but at any rate it is Cobet and not Dr. Holden who should complain.

W. Y. FAUSSET.]

* *

Βουλυτός.—The note on this word in the last number awakened old associations in my country-bred mind. When I lived in the midst of farming, the plough-horses were commonly unyoked and taken home in the middle of the day; and if, at a time of pressure, the ploughing was continued till four or five o'clock, the ploughman called it 'making two noons.' I remember thinking years ago that Gray's reference

to the ploughman returning home in the evening was not true to nature, and the same thought struck me in looking at F. Walker's well-known picture of ploughing in the evening light.

S. CHEETHAM.

* *

ÆSCHYLUS, *Eumenides*.

ll. 34—37.

ἢ δεινὰ λέξαι, δεινὰ δ' ὀφθαλμοῖς δρακεῖν
πάνιν μ' ἐπεμψεν ἐκ δόμων τοῦ Λοξίου
ὥς μήτε σωκεῖν μήτε μ' ἀκταίνειν στάσιν
τρέχω δὲ χερσίν, οὐ ποδακείᾳ σκελῶν.

I believe that the *στάσιν* of the first hand in l. 36 is right, and that *ἀκταίνειν* is simply a strong poetical word for *ἄγειν*, the phrase *ἀκταίνειν στάσιν* being used as *ἄγειν στάσιν* might have been used as an equivalent for *ἐστηκέναι* in the sense of *ὀρθοῖς εἶναι*. In other passages, as the quotations in the ancient lexica show, *ἀκταίνειν* could also carry the passive sense of *ἀκτός* as well as here it carries the active, e.g. of horses *ἀκταίνειν* = *μετεωρίζεσθαι, ἐπαίρεσθαι, γαυριᾶν*. So I have no doubt that *ἀκτάζειν*, as is stated in the *Elym. Mag.*, might also be used in a neuter sense. The passage will then run:

'Yea dread to tell, and dread with the eyes to see, are the things that sped me back from out the chamber of Loxias, so that I have no strength left in me, nor can I abide upright, but my speed is of my hands, not of swiftness of foot.'

ll. 40—46.

I believe that Æschylus wrote:

ὀρῶ δ' ἐπ' ὀμφαλῷ μὲν ἄνδρα θεομυσῇ
ἔδραν ἔχοντα προστρέπαιον, αἵματι
στάζοντα χεῖρας, καὶ νεοσπαδὲς ξίφος
ἐχοντ', ἐλαίας θ' ὑφιγμένῃτον κλάδον,
ἀργῇτι λήνει σωφρόνως ἐστεμμένον.
πρόσθεν δὲ τάνδρως τοῦδε θαυμαστὸς λόχος κ.τ.λ.

The words are clear and straightforward, perfect precision of sequence being, as often, assured by repeating a cardinal word—here *ἄνδρα* of l. 40 resumed in *τάνδρως* of l. 45.

Hesychius glosses both *λήνει* and *ἀργῇτι*.

λήνει ἐρίφ.

ἀργῇτι λαμπρῷ.

and the glossing of these words has doubtless led to the MS. corruption of l. 44, viz.

λήνει μεγίστῳ σωφρόνως ἐστεμμένον
ἀργῇτι μαλλῷ· τῇδε γὰρ τρανῶς ἐρῶ.

where most of the second line is made up of a jumble of glosses—*μαλλῷ* a gloss upon *λήνει* and *τρανῶς ἐρῶ* arising from *τρανῶς ἐρίφ*, a gloss upon *ἀργῇτι μαλλῷ*. The word *τρανός* and its derivatives are common in certain classes of late prose. I would prefer to take *μεγίστῳ* as an attempt to make up the proper number of syllables in the line when *ἀργῇτι* had got misplaced, rather than as an erroneous gloss in the second degree upon *μαλλῷ*.

ll. 67—70.

καὶ νῦν ἀλούσας τάσδε τὰς μάργους ὁρᾷς
ἔκνη, πεσοῦσα δ' αἱ κατὰπτυστοι κόραι
γραιῖαι παλαιαὶ παῖδες αἷς οὐ μίγνυται
θεῶν τις οὐδ' ἀνθρώπος οὐδὲ θῆρ ποτε.

In this passage also I trace the corruption to a jumble of glosses, viz. *πεσοῦσα* for *πεσοῦσας*, a gloss upon *ἀλούσας*, *γραιῖαι* on *παλαιαί*, *κόραι* on *παῖδες*, and *κατὰπτυστοι* an erroneous gloss on *μάργους*: or αἱ *κατὰπτυστοι κόραι* may be an annotator's quotation

U 2

from some other passage of poetry. Probably the Aeschylean text ran :

καὶ νῦν ἀλούσας τάσδε τὰς μάργους ὀρεῖς
ὑπνῳ, παλαιὰς παιδᾶς κ.τ.λ.

ll. 183—184.

ἀνὴρ ὑπ' ἑλγους μέλαν' ἀπ' ἄνων ἀφρόν
ἐμούσα θρόμβους οὐς ἀφείλκυσας φόνου.

I take the words ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων to be a marginal epexegetis of ἀφείλκυσας which has ousted the true reading in line 183. This I think more likely than that they conceal the missing word.

ll. 185—190.

I suggest that these lines originally ran :

οὗτοι δόμοισι τοῖσδε χρίμπεσθαι πρέπει
ἀλλ' οὐ καρανιστῆρες ὀφθαλμοῦχοι
δίκαι, σφαγαὶ τε, σπέρματος τ' ἀποφθοραί,
λευσμοὶ τε, καὶ μύζουσιν οἰκτισμὸν πολλὸν
ὑπὸ βάχιν παγέντες.

'Nay, it fits you to draw nigh not to these chambers, but to spots where dooms abide that cleave the head and gouge the eyes, and shedding of blood, and loss of seed, and stoning and where men impaled make often piteous moan.' The line that follows ἀποφθοραὶ in the MS. is a jumble of glosses and explanations :

παίδων κακοῦται χλοῦνις ἢδ' ἀκρωνία.

The παίδων is epexegetic of ἀποφθοραὶ, the χλοῦνις has the same origin, χλοῦνις having been written in the margin as an explanation of σπέρματος ἀποφθοραὶ, and converted into the would-be feminine substantive χλοῦνις when it got its place in the line. ἀκρωνία may have arisen from another gloss on the same words, such as ἀκρων ἐκτομή μορίων, but, being taken by some editors to mean ἄθροισις, had to be explained by κακῶν or κακοῦ ἄθροισις, an accumulation of suffering, the genitive in its turn originating κακοῦται when the several unintelligible members of mutilated glosses were thrown together into this line.

I prefer in line 189 to change λευσμὸν of M. into λευσμοὶ rather than λευσμός, as the generalising force of the plural adds greatly to the significance of the passage (δίκαι σφαγαὶ ἀποφθοραὶ λευσμοὶ).

καρανιστῆρες is an admirable instance of Aeschylus' manner. The old κάρηνον is Atticised to κάρανον and the verb καρανίζειν formed, supplying in its turn καρανιστήρ, *headsman*.

l. 213—214.

ἢ κάρτ' ἔτιμα καὶ παρ' οὐδὲν ἠρκέσω
Ἥρας τελέας καὶ Διὸς πιστώματα.

In ἠρκέσω we have probably a corruption of ἠργάσω the true augmentation of ἐργάζεσθαι being (as inscriptions prove) in η not ει. It is quite in Aeschylus' manner to say παρ' οὐδὲν ἐργάζεσθαι for the prose παρ' οὐδὲν ποιέσθαι.

ll. 219—221.

εἰ τοῖσιν οὖν κτείνουσιν ἀλλήλους χαλᾶς
τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι μηδ' ἐποπτεύειν κότῳ
οὐ φημ' Ὀρέστην σ' ἐνδίκως ἀνδρηλατεῖν.

The mistake is in the τοῖσιν, not the γενέσθαι.

εἰ δ' οὖν τίσιν κτείνουσιν ἀλλήλους χαλᾶς
τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι μηδ' ἐποπτεύεις κότῳ.

'But if, when men slay one another, thou dost pardon them that the penalty be not paid, nor visitest them in wrath.' ἡ τίσιν γίνεταί is the passive of τίσιν θέσθαι or ποιήσασθαι, the periphrasis by common model of τίτειν. As soon as the itacism τοῖσιν was established, the position of the word had to be altered.

ll. 297—298.

ἔλθοι, κλύει δὲ καὶ πόρρωθεν ὦν θεός,
ὅπως γένοιτο τῶνδ' ἐμοὶ λυτήριος.

It is possible that the otiose parenthesis is interpolated, and that the original ran :

ἔλθοι, γένοιτο τῶνδ' ἐμοὶ λυτήριος,

where the asyndeton is expressive.

W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

P.S. May I correct here two misprints which occur in my notes on p. 261 of the October number? For *Fritsche* read *Fritsche*, and for **ANEIAKON** read **ANEAKON**. The correction of course wholly depends upon the hypothesis that Thucydides used the old Attic alphabet.

* *

WE are glad to hear that the first edition of Mr. Gow's *Companion to School Classics* having been all sold out, a second edition, revised throughout and in part with the help of very eminent authorities, is now in the press.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY.

(Translated from the German original.)

LETTER IV.

SIR,—In my former letters I have spoken of what is taught and learnt in the German *Gymnasium*. It remains for us to ask, who are the instructors in the two Classical Languages, what is the compass of their knowledge and their power; and this leads to the further inquiry as to the education of the teachers, which is in fact the burning question of the day amongst the educationalists of Germany.

The philosophical faculties of our Universities train teachers for the Middle Schools (*Gymnasien* and *Realschulen*) in various lines. They form Historians and Geographers, Mathematicians and Scientists,

German scholars and teachers of modern languages, and finally Classical Philologists. Here we are only concerned with the last. What they study is philological science in its widest range; what should be their aim may be shortly gathered from the Prussian scheme of examination for teachers of higher schools under date Feb. 5th, 1887. It is there said: 'The qualifications required for Latin and Greek teachers in the higher classes are, wide reading in the Roman and Greek classics, especially such as are helpful for the ordinary school lessons, thoroughness in the method of explanation, readiness in the use of Latin both for speaking and writing, and grammatical correctness in writing Greek. The knowledge of Latin

and Greek grammar must be brought into scientific connexion. It is further required that the candidate should have laid a foundation of solid knowledge in regard to antiquities, metre, and the history of literature, which may be hereafter systematically developed, especially in reference to the books read in the *Gymnasia*. In mythology and the archaeology of art the candidate must have advanced sufficiently to make good use of models and other helps, and also to illustrate the lesson by suitable explanations. Besides this, he ought to have an acquaintance with Roman history up to the end of the first century of the empire, and with Greek history as far as the period of the Diadochi. Then for the philosophical examination he should know so much of the history of Greco-Roman philosophy as is necessary for explanation of the classical authors. The course of study occupies on the average eight to nine semesters, and in no case less than six. The students attend lectures of all kinds according to choice, but especially those on classical philology and antiquities, and besides this they have also to attend for some terms in the philological *seminar*. The arrangements of these 'seminaries' differ at the different Universities, but in all alike the chief object is the individual development of the student who learns under the direction of a professor to interpret, to discuss, and to debate, and is practised in the composition of essays, as well as in translation from German into Latin and Greek. The language used in discussion is still Latin in most of the Universities; the power of easy and elegant expression in Latin is still alike the pride of the classical professor and the aim of the classical student. It cannot be denied that in these seminars preponderance is given to a formal training in words, but the realistic side of classical education has justice done to it in the lectures and in archaeological exercises, historical and artistic. Naturally it depends upon the philological professors in each University what special direction the training takes.

As the 'seminar' is, I understand, a peculiarly German institution, a further explanation of its nature and use may not be unwelcome to your readers. The word is used first of the place of meeting. In the newer and better equipped universities, as e.g. at Strassburg, the 'seminar' is a departmental library provided with tables and seats, in which the student can work all day and make free use of the books he requires. Secondly, the term is used for the instruction given. In the 'seminar' the professor descends from his chair; he no longer 'reads,' he converses; dialogue and discussion take the place of monologue. As a rule it is found in connexion with almost every department of science, historical, geographical, legal, political, philosophical; and the course of events seems to point to this, rather than the lecture-room, becoming the centre and pivot of university teaching in the future. The 'seminar' for classical philology has been the longest established, dating as far back as the 18th century, and it is now an established part of every German university. A student who wishes to join has to call on the presiding professor at the beginning of the term, and to satisfy him as to the fulfilment of certain conditions (the production of essays, &c.). The number of the class is limited to about twelve, though others may be admitted as auditors. The professor determines what shall be the work of the class, what author shall be studied, &c., and all the members bind themselves to regular attendance and regular work during the term. The work may be either a written translation or an essay on some point of grammar, metre or criticism selected by the professor. This exercise, whatever it

may be, is afterwards criticised by the professor, and may perhaps give rise to a general discussion on its subject-matter. At other times the student may be called upon to explain a passage from the selected author, which he is expected to have prepared with all possible care beforehand, and this too may afford occasion for discussion, for questions and objections on the part of the other students, and further exposition and excursuses on the part of the professor. In the department of philology we have also what is called a *Proseminar*, forming a kind of transition from mere school work to the scientific handling of the classical authors, which is especially adapted to train the younger students in method. The actual working of the 'seminar' may be illustrated from the programme for the winter semester of the ensuing year in Strassburg. Prof. Leo takes as his subject in the 'Proseminar' the *Plutus* of Aristophanes from 10 to 11 on Friday, and in the 'seminar' the Appendix Vergiliana from 10 to 12 on Wednesday. Prof. Keibel explains Lucian's *Lexiphanes* and presides over discussions in the 'seminar' from 10 to 12 on Saturday, and lectures on the 'Psephismata preserved in literature' on Tuesday from 6 to 8 in the *Institut für Alterthumswissenschaft*.

And here comes the question which is being everywhere debated, whether sufficient consideration is given to the educational requirements of the School as distinguished from the University? Such consideration is no doubt plainly expressed in the rules for the Prussian examinations, but the fact remains that the student is too often tempted to specialize before he is ripe for it, and to select some narrow field of study which serves him later on as the theme of his dissertation for the doctor's degree, or as his select subject for the State examination. Several terms are often occupied exclusively with work of this kind. Even if the students add to this the methodical training which is required, they find themselves when they leave College altogether lacking in wide reading and acquaintance with classical authors, a want which is justly deplored by the directors of the schools, as it entails the loss of the best part of philological culture, that which is required even in the *Abiturient-examen* of the Prussian system, viz. that the students should receive an abiding impression from their study of classical literature, and should feel its influence upon the development of modern literature. But how can the student attain this if his time has been chiefly occupied with Byzantine grammarians? And as to the methodical training, frequently the appointed or selected exercises consist in the collection of statistics with regard to the style of some out-of-the-way author, or the more or less frequent use of some particle &c.; subjects not without interest in themselves—take for instance the present position of the Platonic question—if treated from within as forming part of a larger whole, but without value or interest for a young man who still lacks the larger framework of knowledge. I am well aware that this is not of universal application, that there is a micrology, a minute accuracy of detail, which must never be neglected as belonging to the very essence of philological study. But who can deny that this micrology, whatever may be its importance from the historical point of view, is apt to degenerate into a one-sided love for the minute and out of the way, and produce a sort of barren Alexandrianism? and further that such an influence would be fatal to the interests of school instruction?

As more immediately affecting the school we may consider the examinations for the scholastic profession in some of the South German States, e.g. Württemberg. Here the examination is more central-

ized. All the candidates of the year have the same subject given to write upon. In the final trial all have to send up a written translation of the same passage from German into Latin and Greek, and *vice versa*. All have the same historical themes and the same questions from the history of German literature. Finally, all have to produce an elaborate essay on the same thesis. Above all, the candidate must be thoroughly up in the authors read at school, since the *viol voc* examination chiefly turns upon these. While it may be allowed that a certain scholastic smartness (*Ausbildung*) is attained in this way, on the other hand the examination itself has somewhat too much of scholasticism, and the course of study it prescribes is not calculated to rear scientific philologists; and so in fact we find that Württemberg has latterly produced fewer and fewer of such. And yet, by establishing different examinations for the teachers of lower and higher classes, it would have been quite possible to provide satisfactorily for both.

But be this as it may, since the scientific training of the schoolmaster must always depend upon the prevalent type of philological science, which cannot be changed by any outside influence, not even by the governmental scheme of examination, it is the practical training of the schoolmaster, which is the important question for us. It must be granted, to begin with, that there is something of practical training involved in the scientific character of classical philology itself which has been for the space of 400 years so variously employed and utilized in the service of the school. In the philological seminaries the pupils not only learn what is of scientific value, but are also improving their own teaching powers. Being taught through the medium of oral instruction themselves, they learn how to instruct others in their turn. Though the importance of this training is in my opinion too much undervalued at the present time, yet we certainly cannot say that it includes everything. It is true that the Prussian regulations require 'an acquaintance with the philosophical principles of the science and art of education (*Paedagogik und Didaktik*), and with the most important facts of their development since the 16th century.' Thus the students usually attend lectures on the history, and occasionally on the theory and method of education. This is something, but still we do not get beyond theory and science, there is no practical training. The student, however, does not become a teacher immediately on passing his examination; he begins his career by being what is called a Probationer (*Probekandidat*). Originally it was intended that the young man on leaving the University should be appointed to a *Gymnasium*, where he might be gradually trained as a practical teacher; first by being admitted into the school (*hospitieren*) and listening to the teaching of the different classes, and then by himself teaching under the eye of one of the principal masters, and especially under the close superintendence of the director. An essay drawn from the experiences of his year of trial might to a certain extent show how far the candidate had understood the true scope of instruction and education. In point of fact, however, the matter has taken an essentially different form. In the first place the occasional want of masters, and then the reflection that after all experience is the only teacher, led to the probationers being at once treated as regular masters, and having a class and a definite amount of teaching assigned to them. Being thus made independent and put on an equal footing with their colleagues, these young teachers remained subject only to the superintendence of the director, with the exception of occasional and purely voluntary intercourse with elder colleagues. Again, it is just at the

beginning of the school year that the director is generally busiest, and therefore least able to attend to the probationers, who are thus left to strike out their own line for themselves, with only such assistance as they can obtain from casual hints and criticisms dropped by the director when he happens to look in on the class they are teaching. I say nothing as to the question how far all directors can be expected to have the capacity and vocation, the inclination and desire for such superintendence of young teachers.

The worst of it is that the lowest class (the *Sexta*) is generally handed over to the probationers, since each master naturally prefers the teaching of the higher classes, and the lowest thus falls to the last comer. Theoretically this is defended on the principle that every teacher should start from the ranks, but the result is that the most difficult and the most important part of the teaching is left to an untrained beginner. Thus while the pupils get their first initiation from one who is perhaps not yet quite sure of his ground, the youthful teacher, with his head full of the learning of the University, thinks himself entitled to look down on mere elementary instruction, the real importance of which he is not yet able to appreciate, and the monotony of which gives him a distaste for the work of instruction from the beginning.

The bad consequences of this want of training and method on the part of the teacher have called forth loud complaints from the press, and the demand for the establishment of special University lectures on the theory of education as well as of separate training seminaries for schoolmasters, *i.e.* of paedagogic as distinguished from philological seminaries,* has been much discussed in the Prussian conferences of headmasters, and urged by educationalists of the Herbartian school. At present no definite conclusion seems to have been arrived at; we hear less of positive results than of experiments, which are being made, or are about to be made, in one direction or another. Of these, four principal kinds may be distinguished.

(1) Educational conferences, held under the superintendence of the professor of Paedagogics, for the discussion of practical questions relating to instruction and discipline, whether simply as such, or in relation to some treatise on the theory of education, such as Schiller's *Handbuch der praktischen Paedagogik für höhere Lehranstalten*, 1886. One great advantage of such conferences consists in the students' reminiscences of their own school-days, especially if the younger teachers in the *Gymnasien* and *Realschulen* are willing, as they usually are in University towns, to take part in the conferences and to correct and enlarge the ideas of younger students from their own present experience. It is to be regretted that, while those who are studying mathematics, history, the natural sciences, or modern languages, take a keen interest in these conferences, students of classical philology are for the most part conspicuous by their absence.

(2) Exercises in teaching.—Eight or ten boys from one of the schools in the university town are sent once or twice in the week to receive further instruction from the students in special departments beyond the regular work of their class. Each student takes them for two hours, the first of which is spent in preparing the subject with them and the second in

* Originally the philological seminary was regarded (*e.g.* by F. A. Wolf) as supplying all that was needed for paedagogics, but as the latter aim fell more and more into the background separate seminaries for instruction in paedagogics were introduced mainly owing to Herbart's influence.

hearing and questioning them. Immediately after the dismissal of the class, the professor, who has been present meanwhile to interpose if necessary, points out to the student anything which may need improvement in his method of teaching. This exercise corresponds to the catechetical exercises usual for theological students in all German Universities.

(3) Participation in the ordinary work of a *Gymnasium*.—The student is first admitted to attend the classes (*hospitieren und zuhören*), and then undertakes some subject of instruction for a while with all the duties and privileges of one of the regular masters. This is only practicable where, as at Heidelberg and Giessen, the professor of *Pædagogics* at the University is also headmaster of the *Gymnasium*, otherwise conflicts of authority might arise. It is desirable that a candidate who intends to make the most of such a means of improving himself as a teacher, should have already passed his scientific examination, since this severe practical exercise demands more time and exertion than can be expected of one who is already preparing for a public examination.

(4) Lastly comes the institution of a special training-school, of which the professor of *Pædagogics* should be the head, and the teachers should be Candidates who had passed their examination, together with a few masters of proved skill and ability. In addition to actual teaching, time should be found here for regular lectures and conferences on the practical details of education. It would be essential that the head should be one who would inspire confidence by his practical common sense, as the chief difficulty in the way of the establishment of such a school would probably be found in the unwillingness of parents to allow their children to become, as they might fear, the subjects of rash educational experiments. Perhaps it is not necessary that the school should be connected with the University; it might be started elsewhere on a more purely practical basis. Only I fear that it might then too easily lose its special character as a training-school, and there would be a danger that the reform in the methods of education might be of a merely empirical nature.

It is not my business here to criticise and compare these various suggestions, which are still far from having been elaborated into definite schemes. A financial difficulty arises in regard to some of them, as the students who attend the proposed seminaries after completing their University course would require some stipend or exhibition, and the establishment and maintenance of the seminaries would be in itself an expensive matter. It would also be necessary to institute some sort of practical examination, (such as exists at Württemberg in combination with the examination in the theory of the subject) to prove the fitness of the candidates for the work of their future profession.

It appears to me that the future of the German *Gymnasium* depends upon the solution of this difficult problem. Let me not however be misunderstood. I am far from supposing that training is all that is required to make a good teacher. The maxim *magister nascitur* must be firmly upheld against all one-sided exaggeration, against the belief that salvation is to be found in any method however good. Still less would I be understood to impugn the excellence of our German schoolmasters. No one can have a higher opinion of the value of their services to our country than I have: Germany may well be proud of her schoolmasters. But here too the motto holds good, 'to stand still is to go back,' and however true it may be that 'to teach well one must be a born teacher,' yet this natural aptitude must be brought into consciousness, must be unfolded

and developed by instruction and training in the sphere of education, as in every other. Moreover, the greater prominence which is every day assigned to instruction in mathematics and the natural sciences, not only in the *Realschulen* but also in the *Gymnasien*, makes it more necessary that there should be a previous training in the art and science of teaching. I have already mentioned the keen interest taken in methodological discussions and exercises by students of mathematics and of the natural sciences: if classical teachers are not to be left behind in the race, they must devote themselves more than they have hitherto done to practical training and to the study of the best methods of teaching, as a preliminary to their professional career. On the other hand, the exaggerations of the Herbartian school are not likely to make much way in Germany: the attempt to reduce our scholastic methods to one dead level of uniformity is sure to wreck itself against the ingrained individuality of the German character.

It may be well to refer here to the Prussian ordinance of higher education, which requires each candidate, whatever may be his line of study, to show his acquaintance with the principles of logic, the main facts of empirical psychology, and the more important theories by which it has been sought to explain them. He must also be able to show that he has read with intelligence some standard work of philosophy, and that he has a general knowledge of the history of philosophy. Thus in addition to the special exercises of his own department an exercise is set on some point of philosophical or *pædagogic* interest to be prepared at home. It is in this general philosophical training that it is sought to find a counterpoise for the too special and analytical tendency of philology. Of course, such a result cannot be attained by attendance at one or two lectures in philosophy or by learning off some compendium of philosophy. A thorough training in logic, psychology, and above all in ethics (which last is far too much neglected at present), must be added to the special studies of his own department if the teacher is to be really equipped for the practical work of education. Besides it is only in this way that it is possible to awaken or develop an intelligent interest in the great problems of education so well formulated by Schleiermacher. When this is done, it will perhaps be found that the year of probation supplies all that is wanting for the training of our candidates.

With these suggestions as to a thorough philosophical foundation of the theory of education and the practical work of the teacher in our *Gymnasien* I might close, if it might not perhaps be of interest to your readers for me to refer to a recent announcement which stands in close connexion with questions treated of in our former letters. In my third letter I spoke of the attacks made on our *Gymnasien* from the most opposite quarters. A declaration directed against them has proceeded from the professors of the University of Heidelberg which has already received many hundreds of signatures. From its wording you will perhaps see best on what lines the battle for our *Gymnasium* is at present waged by its defenders. It is here said, 'The continued attacks which have been for some time directed against the humanistic *Gymnasium* in Germany, and with which has been united the cry for its complete transformation, induces the undersigned to make the following declaration:

'While we are far from maintaining the absolute perfection of the system followed in our *Gymnasien*—which by the way varies considerably in different places—or again, from asserting that there is nothing further to be desired in their practical administration, still

we cannot admit the correctness of the melancholy picture which some are so fond of drawing of the results intellectual, moral, and physical, of our classical training. As far as our experience goes, such pictures are by no means in accordance with reality; they are in strong contrast with the subsequent career of students coming from these institutions both at the University and in the various employments of active life. We believe that the German nation has every reason to be thankful for what has been and is being accomplished by means of the German *Gymnasia*; and we deeply grieve that the objectionable habit of running down our own good points, which is too characteristic of our people, is displaying itself in regard to an institution which has often excited the envy of foreigners. Whatever improvements may be still required in the mental and physical training of our boys, as well as in the methods of instruction, whether in regard to mathematics, natural sciences, or the ancient and modern languages, long experience is our warrant for demanding that we should still, in its main outlines, hold to the system of classical education pursued in our *Gymnasia*, and above all should retain that which is its distinguishing mark, the study of the language and literature of Greece. It is only such changes as develop our

existing system without breaking its continuity, that we can regard as desirable in an institution, which must always have a powerful influence on the character of our professional men as well as on the advance of science in Germany.

If your readers derive from my letters the impression that there is much that is shifting and uncertain in the present condition of classical education in Germany, the preceding declaration will explain within what limits this is to be understood. We are determined to hold fast what we have, since we are convinced that it is good on the whole. But in the attacks, which are from time to time made upon our school system, we are reminded that it is our duty to be continually improving it. The continuance of our *Gymnasia* in their present form, and their future growth and prosperity depend upon their not confining themselves to the conservation of what exists, but in ever striving to advance with the time.

Here allow me to conclude my letters on Classical Education in Germany, with thanks for your courtesy in giving me so much space, and apologies to your readers, if at times they may have found me unnecessarily diffuse.

THEOBALD ZIEGLER.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

Roman Literature in relation to Roman Art, by the Rev. ROBERT BURN, M.A. With illustrations. London, Macmillan, 1888. Pp. x. 315. 14s.

THE question, how far the art of a nation is influenced by its national character, is one which has been so fully and frequently discussed that it would be difficult to adduce much that is new, but a catalogue of the 'Schriftquellen' bearing upon art under the Romans—such as these essays suggest—would be a really useful work, if it were complete and well classified by an author thoroughly master of the subject. Unfortunately one cannot place implicit reliance on the criticism of a writer who for purpose of comparison couples (p. 145) 'the fine lines and exquisite detail (*sic*) of the Farnese Hercules or the Apollo Sauroctonos.'

The object of the author is to show how some of the erroneous tendencies in Roman literary and glyptic art had their origin in the national character and circumstances. The essays, five in number, divide the subject into Portraiture, Historical and National tendencies, Composite and Colossal Art, Technical finish and luxurious refinement, and Romano-Greek architecture. The main thread of his argument is as follows. (i) The Romans connected the features with expression of character, but, in keeping with Quintilian's term *similitudo*, were too realistic and made their portraits ugly. (ii) Military pride, sacrificing the beauty of art and poetry to realism and historical accuracy, produced tedious narratives and naturalistic processional reliefs. (iii) In religion, art, and literature, the diverse and complex elements brought together under the Empire, and the enormous increase of wealth, led to phenomena of colossal proportions and complicated detail; the spirit of the age is expressed in Conington's estimate of Statius as a 'miniature painter employed by the caprice of a patron or his own unadvised ambition on a great

historical picture.' (iv) Luxury bred an over-refinement in which the true subject of representation was neglected: the verses of Tibullus are exquisitely polished, but the matter is trivial, so that Seneca says of Roman style that 'it cannot be called composition, for it is really measurement': so in sculpture the measure of admiration was the amount of technical skill displayed in overcoming difficulties.

These conclusions will probably meet with general acceptance. We may be content to estimate the Romans from the standpoint which they themselves give us: they are primarily portrait-sculptors and engineers, not an artistic nation in any other sense, nor did they wish to be: that was left to others.

Excudent alii spirantia mollius aera

Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,
Hæc tibi erunt artes.

It seems however futile to seek to establish a parallel with British Art of the present day: painting is of course out of court: architecture we have none: nor any distinctive style of sculpture, unless we are to accept the biblical vulgarities of Mr. Tinworth and similar excrescences as distinctive: our average independent taste, apart from what the newspaper critics tell us to think, may be summed up in Juvenal's Satire:

Magis illa juvant quæ pluris emuntur—

a passage which I would commend to the label writers of the South Kensington Museum.

What we have principally to thank the Romans for is the precious heritage which they have passed on to us of Greek art: the stray shreds of description in their writers, the feeble, mannered copies, ordered perhaps by the dozen to decorate their villas: these, which are often the only remnants we have of Hellenic masterpieces, are worth to us more

than all the original work of Pasiteles or his disciples. The Roman trait of *severitas* has this effect, that their sculpture was principally left to Greek copyists of Greek work: whereby we moderns have had everything to gain and little to lose.

The illustrations of this book have one serious fault, that in no case the object represented has its provenance from a museum or collection attached. In one instance (p. 50), the title itself is wrong, the bust here given as Domitian being obviously the bust of Nero: and 'Paetus (not 'Poetus' as on p. 160) and Arria' is an absurd and misleading title for the well-known group in the Villa Ludovisi which might really by this time be discarded.

The last essay stands quite apart from the remainder of the volume: its two final paragraphs have probably been inserted in the attempt to preserve the unities and to draw a parallel between the tendencies of Roman Architecture and Roman Literature: with this exception, it is mainly taken from an earlier work by Mr. Burn, 'Rome and the Campagna.' It is a clear and suggestive sketch of the history and development of Roman Architecture from the earliest to the latest times, as it grew up under political and climatic circumstances: it shows that the arch is the essential Roman constructive motive, but that, partly owing to hybrid union with Greek forms, the decorative capabilities of the arch itself were never developed: this was left for the Gothic style to bring about, which is really founded upon Roman rudiments.

CECIL SMITH.

ACQUISITIONS OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

[With reference to the vase from Hawara recently presented to the Museum (see *C. R.* 1888, p. 266) and described as 'for holding crocodile food,' Mr. A. S. Murray points out that it is an exact illustration of Strabo, xvii. p. 812. The author is describing the city of Arsinoë, formerly called Crocodilopolis, and relates how his host gave him ocular demonstration of the cult of the crocodile there—*συνῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν λίμνην, κομίζων ἀπὸ τοῦ δέλτου πλακουντρίον τι καὶ κρίας ὅσων καὶ προχοιδίων τι μελικράτου*: they found the crocodile at the water's edge, and while one of the priests opened its mouth, another placed in it first of all the cake, then the meat, and finally poured in the syrup. This was the regular custom, the beast being called *Σούχος*.

The vase in question, as Mr. Murray remarks, would very well suit the term *προχοιδίον*: on the front of it is inscribed in black ink 'Ἱεροῦ Σούχου(ου), with a line over it which may read as a dedication by one Πυρρός (?).

The following were accidentally omitted from no. 8, p. 266 *ante*.

b. Limestone tablet with Egyptian relief of a person adoring a deity. Behind him stands Isis: below is a Greek inscription, much injured: Ptolemaic period.

c. Limestone slab with late Greek inscription in memory of a turner (*τῶν πνευτής*, sic) named Didymus.

d. Wooden label with dedication in late Greek by one Diogenes in honour of a native of Arsinoë named Nablas.

e. Piece of linen with late Greek inscription in memory of one Diogenes an *ἡπίστης* or 'mender.'

f. Six vases with remains of different colours in them, and a series of other objects in terra-cotta.

g. Limestone head of a female figure. Late Roman.

h. Terra-cotta lamp with shade.

i. Fragments of painted pottery of a very late period.

k. Limestone fragment with remains of late Greek epitaph.

1. a. Marble bust of Diana, about three quarter life size: the left shoulder and tip of nose restored: Graeco-Roman work: from the Fayoum.

b. Seven small intaglios and one cameo.

c. Two leaden plummets.

2. a. A bronze mask of Zeus Ammon, from Corinth: good Greek work and beautiful patina.

b. Chalcidony scaraboid, man and horse; Macedonia.

c. Nicolo with Romano-Egyptian design; from the Montigny Collection.

d. Agate scarab: man and horse.

e. Agate scaraboid: archer shooting a goat.

f. Sard intaglio: girl with a vase.

g. Sardonyx cameo: Hippocamp: Rhodes.

h. Silver archaic ring, from Marion in Cyprus.

i. Bronze ring with intaglio of Capaneus.

k. Bronze intaglio: bust of Minerva: Smyrna.

l. Terra-cotta statuette of a woman holding an infant wrapped in her himation: from Cyme.

m. A large krater painted in red figures with polychrome accessories: *obv.* the infant Herakles strangling the serpents in presence of Zeus, Amphitryon and others: *rev.* Satyrs: recently discovered. (Mr. A. S. Murray has communicated a note on the subject of this vase, which will appear in the December number.)

n. A set of archaic vases of Boeotian style, from Thebes; consisting of a pyxis: an amphora with cover, painted with archaic animals in the Phaleron style, black upon the brown clay: a lebes and two four-handled vases which have designs painted in black and purple upon a whitish slip. Similar vases are published in the *Gazette Archéologique*, 1888, nos. 7-8, pl. 26.

o. A terra-cotta figure of Bes, from Alexandria.

3. a. A large chalcidony scaraboid, with intaglio of a lion attacking a bull.

b. Banded onyx scarab: a Satyr carrying off a girl.

4. a. Rock-crystal intaglio: cornucopiae (?): from Smyrna.

b. Burnt carnelian intaglio: bearded head, ΖΜΑΡΑΓΔΟΥ: from Jerusalem.

c. Burnt carnelian, fragmentary: remains of Latin inscription, apparently two names within a wreath.

d. Yellow jasper: Victory holding out a wreath: ROMA.

e. Sard intaglio: palm-tree: from N. Syria.

f. Bronze bezel of a ring: lion attacking a deer.

g. Silver do.: nude female figure.

5. a. Alabaster statuette of the archaic Apollo type, beautiful workmanship: from Naukratis.

b. Five fragmentary Greek inscriptions: from the Fayoum.

6. Bronze mirror case of Etruscan work, with a relief of the young Dionysos winged, offering wine from a phiale to a panther. C. S.

The illustrated edition of the Catalogue of the 'objects of Greek Ceramic Art' exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club during this summer (see *C. R. ante*, p. 189) has just been issued. It will form a most important addendum to archaeological libraries, for it comprises upwards of fifty handsome plates, twenty of which are of vases for the most part unpublished, all of them remarkable.—Where so much is good, it were perhaps ungracious to complain that in England we have still much to learn in our methods of illustration of works of Greek Art; some of the plates, notably the beautiful polychrome *lekkythos*, No. 51, leave nothing to be desired. C. S.

Athenische Mittheilungen. 1888, part 2. Athens.

1. Winter: the 'calfbearer' statue, of which the inscribed base was found last year on the Acropolis: its place in the history of Art: four cuts. 2. Gomperz: the decree relating to the allotment of Salamis, new readings and alterations. 3. Six: the inscription with the artists' names Mikkiades and Archermos. 4. Studniczka: notes of a journey during last year in Chios: forty-four Greek inscriptions: a curious prehistoric terra-cotta head: and seventeen marble sculptures: nineteen cuts, two plates. 5. Conze: Hermines-Kadmilos: three cuts, one plate. 6. Schliemann: ten Athenian sepulchral inscriptions found near his house in Athens. 7. Dörpfeld: identifying the ancient course of the stream Eridanos: plate. 8. Schuchhardt: identifies a figure on a relief as the personification of Paralia, the winning Phyle at the Dionysia. 9. Dörpfeld and Wolters: literature and discoveries. C. S.

Gazette Archéologique. Nos. 7-8 1888. Paris.

1. Deglane: the palace of the Caesars on the Palatine, (continued): two cuts, two plates. 3. Pottier: studies in Greek pottery: (i) notes and additions to Klein's *Meistersignaturen*²: (ii) the fictile acquisitions of the Louvre since Feb. 1886: with two plates of Boeotian vases. Reviews of Darenberg's 'Dictionnaire', Del. — Dil.: Heydemann's 'Pariser Antiken': Podschialow's 'Monnaies des Rois du Bosphore Cimmerien': Rayet et Collignon's 'Céramique Grecque.' C. S.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. April, 1888. Athens and Paris.

1. Deschamps and Cousin: thirty-seven Greek inscriptions from the temple of Zeus Panameros; principally dedications and ex votos to Zeus and Hera, also to Zeus Kannokos and Artemis *Καρδάρι*, &c. 2. Fougères: archaic bas-relief from Tyrravos (Phalanna); head of a woman who has held a distaff: probably from latter part of sixth century: plate. 3. Paton: seven Greek inscriptions from Myndos. 4. Foucart: the gold statues of Victory which, as we know from inscriptions, existed in the time of Perikles on the Akropolis, were probably in his time ten in number. 5. Delattre: leaden engraved imprecation from Carthage. 6. Dareste: note on an hypothecary inscription. 7. Holleaux: an inscription from Acraephiae, republished, with new readings, from Keil. 8. Homolle: two bas-reliefs found at Delos: (a) seated woman: (b) part of a figure of Artemis: probably fragments of stelae with treasure lists: plate. 9. Deschamps: précis of excavations at Amorgos. 10. Foucart: decree from Magnesia on the Maeander: and an Athenian decree. 11. Lechat: excavations on the Akropolis. C. S.

The same. May—November, 1888.

1. Lechat: account of the excavations at the Peiraus, with a plan of the ancient fortifications: plate and cut: with several inscriptions found there. 2. Baltazzi: thirty-two Greek inscriptions from Aegolis. 3. Fougères: stèle of girl beside a palm-tree, from Mantinea: perhaps a priestess of Latona; Dorian work of the end of the fifth century: plate. 4. Holleaux: excavations at the temple of Apollo Ptoos: two bronze siren-like figures, of Egyptian style (plate): and a bronze statuette of a woman holding a fruit, probably archaic: plate. 5. Svoronos: identifies the Kretan money called *λίθινες* with certain staters of the fifth and fourth centuries: confirming the later date assigned by Kirchhoff to the Gortyna law: four cuts. 6. Homolle: inscription from Delos of about 300 B.C. with the new name of a

sculptor, Teletimos. 7. Foucart: Latin inscription of the time of Hadrian, from Mt. Pangaeus. 8. Doublet: restores an inscription given in the *Mittheilungen*, from Pompeiopolis, in honour of Pompey. 9. Lechat: excavations on the Akropolis. C. S.

Archäologisches Jahrbuch. Part ii, 1888. Berlin.

1. Robert: the Telephos frieze from Pergamon, continued: twelve cuts. 2. Furtwängler: gems with artists' signatures: (a) cameos, (b) intaglios, in the Berlin collection: plate. 3. Löwy: r.f. cup of the Faina collection in Orvieto, signed by Duris: plate. 4. Cecil Smith: notes on the Theseus cup in the British Museum (Klein, No. 16): cuts. 5. Heydemann: notes on Berlin antiquities: (a) the miniature figures on columns, like the Paestum bronze, are probably not complete dedications, but parts of groups such as lamp stands: (b) the torso (Friedrich-Wolters, No. 496) is not an Apollo, but a boxer, *σκιαμαχῶν*: (c) the Epiktetos vase (No. 2170) is an abbreviated type of the Judgment of Paris (with a list of similar abbreviations of this myth): (d) Tölken, *Gemmensamml.* I. 80 = Iphigeneia, not Bubastis: II. 70 = Seilenos, not Herakles: III. 42 = not Prometheus, nor the 'betende knabe' (Furtw.), but a youth diving. 6. Belger: the so-called 'dying Gaul' is shown, by comparison with other similar groups, and by the position of his wound, to have been struck down by an enemy, not by his own hand. Bibliography. Summaries. C. S.

The same. Part iii, 1888. Berlin.

1. Treu: suggesting a new arrangement for the Western Pediment of the Olympia Temple: double plate, five cuts. 2. Loeschke: a marble relief from Messene in the Louvre (end of IVth century), representing probably the combat of Alexander and Krateros with a lion, as in a group by Lysippos and Leochares: plate and cut. 3. Furtwängler: signed gems, continued; (ii.) signed gems in various collections: plate. 4. Michaelis: contesting Kern's view (*ante*, p. 68) that the Lateran Peliades relief must have been known before 1814, and that the Berlin replica is a modern copy of it. 5. von Duhn: parting scene on a Campanian hydria in Karlsruhe, with inscription 'Zeus Soter': cut. 6. Kern: the 'Pharmakentriai' on the chest of Kypselos. 7. Michaelis: the relief 'Demosthenes Epibomios' see C. S. 1887, p. 313) is certainly false: two cuts. 9. Furtwängler: acquisitions of British and Berlin Museums, 1887; thirteen cuts. Bibliography. C. S.

Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1887. Parts 2, 3. Athens.

1. Koumanoudes: Attic inscription relating to some public building in Delos. 2. The same: two Boeotian cups, with representations in relief of (i) scenes from Euripides *Iph. in A.*, inscribed with the names of the actors; (ii) a scene from the *Iliad*, with the *χάραξ Ἀχαιῶν*, also inscribed: plate. 3. Tsountas: two honorary decrees, and a long list of names from Eretria. 4. Philios: inscriptions from Eleusis, continued (four). 5. Benndorf: painted pinax from the Acropolis, inscribed *Γλαυκίτης καλός*: coloured plate and four cuts. 6. Staes: archaic polychrome statue from the Acropolis: two coloured views. 7. Studniczka: statuettes of Athene from the Acropolis: two plates, fifteen cuts. C. S.

American Journal of Archaeology. 1888, vol. IV. No. 1.

1. Reinach: an inedited portrait of Plato: plate (a bust from Smyrna in the Louvre), and cut. 2. Ramsay: antiquities of S. Phrygia and the border-

lands, continued: the Phrygo-Pisidian frontier: two plates. 3. Trowbridge: Archaic Ionic capitals found on the Acropolis: cuts. 4. Emerson: an engraved bronze wall at Metaponto: probably dedicated to Apollo Lykeios: cut.

Notes. Marquand: early Athenian-Ionic capitals found on the Acropolis: cut. The excavations in Icaria by the American school at Athens. Letter from Greece. Archaeological news. C. S.

The same, Vol. IV. No. 2.

1. Frothingham: Notes on Christian mosaics: the lost mosaics of the East. 2. Buck: inscriptions found upon the Acropolis. 3. Emerson: a laughing girl and a study of coiffure; a terra-cotta head in Munich: plate. 4. Marquand: archaic patera from Konour in New York.

Notes. Vetulonia and early Italic archaeology: two plates. Reviews. Archaeological news. Summaries. C. S.

Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma, 1888. Rome.

VI.—1. Cantarelli: corrections and additions to Corsini's (1766) series of the Prefects of Rome. 2. Petersen: seated marble statue of Penelope, the third replica of this type, recently found in the gardens of the Esquiline: plate. 3. Gatti: discoveries topographical and epigraphical. Bibliography. C. S.

Part VII.—1. Gatti: a *sacellum compitale* found in the old Esquiline region: with inscription showing that it was restored by Augustus B.C. 10; and other objects found with it: plate. 2. Marucchi: recent discoveries at the cemetery of S. Valentino on the via Flaminia. 3. De Rossi: on the 'praepositus de via Flaminia.' 4. Visconti: discoveries of works of art. C. S.

Part VIII.—1. Stevenson: the Septizonium of Severus, and the destruction of its foundations under Sextus V.: two plates. 2. Gatti: discoveries topographical and epigraphical: including part of a Roman calendar (April 1—3, 18—29, May 1—4): other parts of a calendar are known, probably from the same monument. 3. Visconti: notes on the Public Works, in relation to art and archaeology. 4. Gatti: most recent discoveries. C. S.

Archaeological Review, 1888, vol. i. (March—August). London.

P. 39. Index notes, Roman remains, Wiltshire: papers contributed to Archaeological Societies of Great Britain during 1886—7. p. 115, the same—Gloucestershire. p. 119. Review of Naue's 'Die Hügelgräber zwischen Ammer- und Staffelsee.' p. 191.

Allen: a Museum of Christian Archaeology. p. 210. Index notes: Archaeological Societies 1886—7, p. 259. Buckland: recent discoveries of pre-historic remains in Spain. p. 274. Index notes: Price: Roman remains in London. p. 281. Quarterly Report of Archaeological discoveries in the British Isles. p. 352. Lukis: Megalithic monuments. p. 354. Exhibition of Egyptian antiquities. p. 355. Index notes: Price: Roman remains in London. p. 405. Petrie: Archaeology in Egypt. p. 413. Miles: Aventicum, the Roman metropolis of Helvetia. p. 434. Index notes: Haverfield: Roman remains in Sussex. C. S.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. July—August, 1888. Louis Blancard. 'The two kinds of "folles" mentioned in the Imperial Edicts of the fourth century.'

Revue Numismatique, 3rd ser. vol. vi. 3rd trimestre, 1888. J. N. Svoronos. 'Inedited and uncertain coins of Crete' (2nd article). *Dictynna, Eltyna, Polichna*—coins are for the first time attributed to these places. *Hierapytna*. The large coins hitherto assigned to the small town of Pyranthus are shown to belong to Hierapytna. *The two places named Latos*. The attribution to 'Latos Etera' is ingenious, but not quite convincing. *Rhaucus*. A probable attribution of silver coins hitherto attributed to Lycia or to Poseidon in Carpathus. *Elyros, Hyrtacos, Lisos and Tarrha*. A new silver coin of Tarrha with the types (Goat's head, rev. Bee) of Elyrus and Hyrtacos is published. The coin-types of the above-mentioned places would suggest that a monetary convention existed between them. *Lisos and Hyrtacos*. On the thin gold and silver coins with (usually) a bird on each side. They are found in the West of Crete, and M. Svoronos attributes them to Lisos. The inscriptions on some of the specimens show that they were struck jointly by Lisos and Hyrtacos.—E. Lépaule. 'The Roman Coinage at the end of the Empire' (Part 1).—L. Blancard. 'Un Millarés [*mithradatense*] d'Arcadius: étude sur le millarés de Constantin à Heraclius.'—Th. Reinach. 'Essai sur la numismatique des rois de Pont.' The second and concluding article deals ably with the coinage of Mithradates the Great (Eupator). M. Reinach gives full lists of the coins struck by Mithradates or under his authority.

The well-known series of bronze coins inscribed BAE struck in the kingdom of Bosphoros and usually assigned by Russian numismatists to Mithradates (E = 'Eupator') are supposed by Reinach to have been issued by some other ruler of Bosphoros.—Review of J. Laugier's *Monnaies massaliotes*, by E. Babelon.

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Hermathena: No xiv. 1888. A. Palmer, *Miscellanea Critica*; emendations on Soph. *Ant.* 746, 789, 672; *Phil.* 782, 757; Eur. *Troad.* 777; *Her.* 398, 479, 502, 559; *Suppl.* 138, 1194, 557, 449, 1010; *I. in A.* 250; *Frag. Com.*; *Plaut. Asin.* 4. 1. 26, *Cist.* 4. 1. 16, *Cas.* 2. 6, 5; *Virg. A.* 4. 371, 436; *Hor. C.* 1. 12. 15.—Dr. Maguire reviews Mr. Archer-Hind's *Timaeus*—Prof. Tyrrell objects to Mr. Newman's conservative treatment of the text of the *Politics* in itself, and as inconsistent with the author's view of the MSS., and discusses A.'s views on slavery, giving a new interpretation of Dr. Maguire's.—Mr. T. K. Abbott reviews White's *Old Latin Biblical Text* iii.—Mr. Lendrum

writes an excellent review of Mr. Fausset's *Pro Cluentio*.—Dr. Ingram notes that *novicius* is the only Latin word not formed from a past participle which has the *i* long, and suggests that it is for *novo-vicius* = *νέοικος*.

Academy: 22 Sept., Notices of Davidson's Polybius, Underhill's Hellenica, Sidgwick's selections from Plato, etc. Prof. Sayce reviews Evers' *Das Emporkommen der persischen Macht unter Cyrus*.—13 Oct. F. T. Richards reviews Keller's *Thiere des classischen Alterthums*.

Philologus, vol. xli. part 4, contains:—

I. Abhandlungen.

21. O. Weise, *Die farbenbezeichnungen bei den Griechen u. Römern*. Names of colours shown from their etymology to have been adapted either from (a) distinctions of light and dark, (b) examples in nature, or (c) composition of these with prepositions or each other. 22. O. Crusius, *Coniectanea ad comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. I. *Ad mediae Atticorum comediae fr.* II. *Ad novae comediae fr.* 23. R. Ehwald, *Curae exegeticae*. 1. *duplex Victoria* in a fragment of Luxorius. 2. *versi Octaviani* in the codex Dalmasianus of the anthologia Latina. 3. On a line shown to be in Gothic, *ibid.* 4. Tibullus in the early middle ages. 5. A wall-painting at Pompeii. 24. L. Holzappel, *Zu Ciceros briefen, Ad fam.* I. 2. (*quam for quamquam and infra 'tempus hic magis'*). II. 15, 2 (*pudicitia for prudentia*). VIII. 8, 5 (*Cacsaem for Caesar, and voluerit for poterit*). VIII. 11, 4 (*explicationes for explosiones*). VIII. 13, 2 (*coram cognoscant*); *ad Q. Fr.* II. 1 (*praetorii sane frequentes, fuimus . . . for praetores, sane . . . and infra dele sero*). II. 3, 2 (*pergravi for peregrat*). II. 4, 5 (*qui bonus est . . .*). 25. C. John, *Der tag der ersten rede Ciceros gegen Catilina* 'Nov. 8th.' 26. W. Soltan, *Die kalenderverwirrung zur zeit des zweiten punischen krieges*. Originated in the circumstances of the year 207 B.C. 27. D. Detlefsen, *Untersuchungen zu den geographischen büchern des Plinius*. 2. *Die quellen des Plinius in der beschreibung des Pontus*.

II. Jahresberichte.

H. Kallenberg, *Herodot.—II. Ausgaben u. konjek-turalkritik*.

III. Miscellen.

A. *Zur erklärang u. kritik der schriftsteller*. 12. R. Thommen, *Ueber die abfassungszeit der Geschichten des Polybius*. Supporting his hypothesis that Bks. 1-30 were published before 150 B.C. 13. X. Kreuttner, *Die stoischen definitionen der affekte bei Suidas*. 'Compiled from Diog. La. vii. 110-117.' 14. A. Höckermann, *Iuven. sat. iv. 297-301. Read faciant: and make irati those who are assaulted*. 15. S. Linde, *In Senecan Rhetorem*. 16. G. Helmreich, *Zu Scribonius Largus*. 17. M. Petschenig, *Zur kritik des Apuleius*. B. *Zur geschichte u. mythologie*. 18. G. F. Unger, *Der anfang des Kleomenes III.* 19. R. Unger, *Zur Sirensensage*. 20. O. Crusius, *Fulmina ex pelvi*. 'A translation of ἀστραπή ἐκ πυέλου, found in Ps. Diogen. 207, p. 215.

C. *Auszüge aus schriften u.s.w.*

Notes: C. Haeblerlin, *Zu Theokritos*.—O. Crusius, *De Constantino Manasse Planudae auctore*.—Th. Stangl, *Horatius*, c. I. 37, 24. 'Read reseravit for reparavit.'—M. Petschenig, *Zu Seneca, 'Ad Marc.* 18, 5, read *adulta fructui seges*, 18, 6 <alucum> aurum and torridae ignium faeces. De provid. 6, 7. Prono animam loco posui tradituro. De ira II. 9, 3, ex uno partu.'

Philologus, vol. xlvii. part 1 (first half) = n. s. vol. i. 1, contains:—

1. W. Hörschelmann, *Zur Geschichte der antiken Metrik*. I. *Διαποπάλ*. From Cod. Paris. 2676, Fol. 9v. Hitherto unpublished: varies considerably from the other sources, especially in showing βουκολικόν to be a line in which no foot ends with a word.—2. R. Peppmüller, *Zu den homerischen Hymnen*. I. *Zum Hymnus auf Aphrodite*. II. 11-13 spurious, read *καὶ δὲ τε* and *ἔργα διδάξεν ἐν* in II. 14-15. Place I. 30 after I. 32. Read *τάφος* for *ἔπος* in I. 90, *ποιεῖν δ' εἰσπίσω* for *ποιεῖ, λεχέσσει κλιθῆναι* and of II. 126-7, *πέμνον* for *πέμψαι* I. 137, *πέσι δακρυότος*

I. 237, cf. ε. 402, *ῥῥῥ' εἰ* l. 276. II. *Zu den kleineren Hymnen Dionys.* (VI.), l. 28, *τῆλεται* for *ἐλπομαι*. 55. *ιδόντα* for *διε κάτα*. *Helios*, l. 19, *θεά . . . ἰδεῖν*, *Selene* 10 *πρωτέρω ἔλδον*.—3. Th. Zieliński, *Eine Reform des Aristophanes*. On the development of the Agon in comedy.—4. O. Crusius, *Coniectanea ad comediae antiquae fragmenta*.—5. O. Weise, *Ein Beitrag zum Vulgärlatein*. Hybrid formations from Latin roots, by Greek suffixes, &c.—6. Elimar Klebs, *Das Valesische Bruchstück zur Geschichte Constantins*. Interpolations from Orosius, whence mistaken belief in the author's Christianity. General remarks.

Notes:—W. Schmid, *Emendationum ad Dionem Chrysostomum specimen I.*—O. Crusius, *Ad inscriptiones Phrygias notulae*.—W. Schmid, *Emendationum ad D. Chrys. specimen II.*—R. Unger, *Zu Manilius* V. 546.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik. Ed. Fleckeisen u. Masius. Leipzig. 1888.

Heft 4 contains: (1) F. Weck, *Homerische Probleme*, a series of criticisms continued from 1885. (2) A. Scotland, *Athene-Mentor in Ithake*, criticisms of this episode in a. (3) A. Ludwig, *Zu Hesiodos*, comment on a scholion to a 85, in which Hesiod is quoted as distinguishing ἁγυῖα from ἀγυρία. (4) W. Pokel, *Zu Aristoph.*, a long series of criticisms. (5) F. Polle, *Zu Ovid. Metam.*, a similar series. (6) K. Goebel, *sc u. inter se*, hostile criticism of Menge's article on the use of *inter se* in Caesar, summarised *supra* p. 127 b. (7) R. Opitz, *Anz. von Seneca's Rhetor ed. H. J. Müller*, an account of the editor's procedure followed by a great number of criticisms on passages. 'Much remains to do, but any new attempt must be founded on Müller's ed.' (8) M. C. Gertz, *Zu Seneca Rhetor*, another series of emendations. (9) H. Blumner, *Zu Persius*, proposing *farrago* for *sartago* in I. 80. (10) W. Soltan, *Chronologische Vorurtheile*, criticism of an article by Niese in *Gott. Gel. Anz.* Nov. 1887. (11) Th. Berndt, *Zu Livius*, proposing to take *mult. dist. coepti sunt*, in xxi. l. 48, as parenthetical.

Hefte 5 and 6 contain:—(1) A. Weidner, *Zu Lysias*, many emendations. (2) J. Beloch, *Das Griech. Heer bei Plataiai*, partly controversial but maintaining, in fine, that the Greek hoplites at Plataea were only about 25,000 and the total Greek army about 60,000. (3) A. Bauer, *Der Ueberfall von Plataiai*, a controversy with E. A. Junghahn (cf. *supra* p. 127 a, bottom). (4) R. Oehler, *Zur Nautik der Alten*, a note on the use of bored mooring-stones (λογγῶνες in *Etym. Mag.*) in harbours. (5) F. Rühl, *Vermischte Bemerkungen*, very mixed indeed, criticism, history, and geography. (6) H. Stadtmüller, *Zur Anth. Pal.*, emendations. (7) E. Dittrich, *Zu Kallimachos*, proposing *ἡρώνη* for *ἡρώη* in fr. 172. (8) M. Wellmann, *Diphilos u. Hikesios*, citations from Athenaeus, shewing that Hikesios was copying Diphilos. (9) F. Harder, *Ueber die poet. Fragmente des Asinius Pollio*, to the effect that there are none except the words *Veneris antistita Cuprus*. (10) L. Triemel, *Zum Catonischen Gründungsj. Roms*, contending for 751 B.C. against Unger's 759. (11) P. Regell, *Auguralia*, chiefly on the limited *specio* of augurs. (12) E. Anspack, *Zu Horat. Carm.* III. 30, defending the text but suggesting a new division into stanzas (5, 3, 3, 5). (13) E. Baehrens, *Ad Orientium*, notes on Robinson Ellis's edition in *Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat.* xvi. (14) E. Baehrens, *Zu Seneca et Minucius Felix*, a few notes. (15) H. Nohl, *Ueber die Hands. von Ciceros Deiotariana*, defending the classification adopted in his edition. (16) F. Bolte, *Die Quellen von Charisius I 15 u. 17*, a very long article, the scope of which is indicated by the sub-title 'Kritische

Beiträge zur Gesch. der Römischen Nationalgrammatik.' (17) F. Walter, *Zu Tac. Hist.* I. 66, proposing *aquis sane auribus* for *sauribus*.

Heft 7 contains the following articles:—(1) Th. Plüss, *Zu Soph. O. T.* 216-275, a careful analysis of the speech, bringing out its dramatic merits. (2) F. Kern, *Zu Soph. Ant.*, defending his conjecture *ἐνός* in l. 392, and proposing *ὡς ἔπαιες, δ' τέκνον, τὸ νῦν* in l. 855. (3) E. Hiller, *Zu Pindaros Pyth.* vi. 37, maintaining that Antiochos is the subject of *ἀντίρρην*. (4) E. Hiller, *Zu den Griech. Florilegien*, citing evidence that Clemens Al. and Stobaeus used the same florilegium. (5) K. Busche, *Zu Eur. Andr.*, a series of criticisms on the text. (6) P. R. Müller, *Zu Lysias* 21 § 25, proposing *τοὺς παῖδας τοῦτους περὶποιήσαι, ἡγουμένους κ.τ.λ.* (7) O. Crusius, *Zu den Aristophanesscholien*, criticising Bacher's note on *Schol. Vespa* 603 in N. J. 1887, p. 532. (8) P. Trenkel, *Die Begründung der Endeixis gegen Theokrines* [Dem.] 58, a discussion of the form of action adopted. (9) A. Goethe, *Zu Cic. de Nat. De.*, proposing II. 31 *in mundo valentius*, and adopting *autoritates* for *auctores* in l. 10, and *ex quo scilicet videmus* in II. 147. (10) H. Magnus, *Zu Catullus* c. 112, adopting a suggestion of Mr. Bury's that *multus* is pass. part. of *molere* sensu obsc. (11) J. H. Müller, *Zu den Fragm. des Livius*, contending that the words *auratae vaginae* cet. in Nonius, p. 194, 20 do not belong to Livy the historian at all, but probably to Lucilius. (12) M. Kinderlin, *Zu Quintilianus*, a very long series of criticisms. (13) J. Richter, *Zu Dem. Olynth.*, suggesting that in l. § 1, the words *τῆς ὅμ. τύχης ἰσθλ.* are parenthetic and *ἐκείθεν* must be changed to *ἐκείθι*. (The paedagogic portion contains another interesting report of the annual conference on *Einheitschulen*, in which Greek is to be substituted for Latin.)

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie,
1887:—

7 Dec. Wolff-Bellermann, *Sophokles: Aias* 4A (H. G.), 'hyperconservative.'—W. Graeber, *Neben-geordnete Satzbildung* (W. Volbrecht), 'stimulating.'—J. Geffcken, *De Stephano Byzantio* (P. Roellig), 'adds to the fragments of Apollon. Let. and Alex. Polyb.'—P. Geppert, *Zum Monumentum Ancyranum* (G. Zippel), 'probable but not proven.' 14 Dec. C. de Boor, *Theophylacti historiae* (F. Hirsch), 'a service to Byzantine history.'—E. Reichenart, *Der Infinitiv bei Lucretius* (H. Stürenburg), 'a meritorious contribution to the history of Latin syntax.'—Jo. Müller, *Taciti opera*, vol. II. (Pfitzner), a discussion of many passages in Hist. ii. 21 Dec. G. Meyer, *Griech. Grammatik* 2A (P. Cauer), 'as regards the language of Homer useless.'—Ett. de Ruggiero, *Dizionario epigrafico* Lf. 3-6 (G. Zippel), 'even superior to the first part.' 28 Dec. H. Wiegand, *Platōa zur Zeit des Einfalls der Perser* (Holm), 'acute.'—Usener, *Altgriechischer Versbau* (J. Menrad), 'it could be wished that the basis were sounder.'—R. Ausfeld, *De libro περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι λέγεσθαι* (J. Dräseke), a favourable review.—P. Langen, *Plautinische Studien* (W. Abraham), 'should be read by every student of Plautus.' 4 Jan. Ascoli, *Sprachwissenschaftliche Briefe* (Schweiger-Sidler), 'splendid researches.'—H. Flach, *Peisistratos* (Holm), sympathetic review.—Ihm, *Der Mütterkultus* (L. Friedländer), 'in this excellent treatise all the questions involved in the subject are definitely settled.'—Ströbel, *Zur Handschriftenkunde Ciceros* (Th. Stange), 'valuable.' 11 Jan. Launitz-Trendelenburg, *Wandtafel xxiv. Die Akropolis von Athen* (x.), 'good but even now in many cases

antiquated.'—Mischtschenko, *Ein Urtheil über Herodot* (M. Baron Wolff), a defence of Hdt. against Prof. Sayce.—J. Bassfreund, *D. Materie bei Plato* (K. Wenzig), 'correct standpoint, unfortunately not adhered to.'—H. J. Müller, *Senecae sententiae divisiones colores* (Max Sander), 'has not made sufficient use of his MS. material.' 18 Jan. J. E. Sandys, *An Easter Vacation in Greece* (H. Stürenburg), 'contains nothing new.'—F. A. Paley, *The Truth about Homer* (Joh. Oberdieck), 'Paley, "the deep thinker and great scholar," is right about Homer.'—M. Manitius, *Zu Aldhelm u. Baeda* (M. Petschenig), 'full of matter.' 25 Jan. H. Seiling, *Ursprung des Homerischen Verses* (H. Draheim), 'built on a sound basis.'—G. Harster, *Novem vitae sanctorum metricae* (M. Manitius), 'H. shows himself equal to his task.'

1 Febr. Robert-Preller, *Griechische Mythologie* (P. Stengel), 'every page shows how much the work has benefited by Robert's revision.'—Ae. Baehrens, *M. Minucii Octavii* (Dombart) unfavourable review of B.'s preface. 8 Feb. C. Schuchhardt, *Andronici περὶ παθῶν pars altera* (X. Kreutner), 'thorough and exhaustive.'—R. Reitzenstein, *Ferriani. Forschungen* (H. Winther), 'important for all who wish to utilise Festus' learning.'—R. Schultz, *Questiones in Tibulli chronol.* (Fr. Hankel), 'clever.' 15 Feb. W. Deecke, *D. griech. u. latein. Nebensätze* (H. Ziemer), 'all who are concerned with the comparative syntax of the Indog. languages will be thankful for it.'—G. Uhlig, *Dionysii Thracis ars grammatica* (P. Egenolf), 'no true scholar can afford to overlook it.' 22 Feb. Fitzpatrick, *An Autumn Cruise in the Aegean* (S. Herrlich), 'extremely stimulating and interesting.'—O. Keller, *Tiere d. klassischen Altertums* (G. Hergel), 'interesting both to scholars and to the wider public.'—C. Bürger, *De Lucio Patrensi* (A. Thimme), 'an advance on Goldbacher but does not settle the question.'—O. Ribbeck, *Gesch. der Römischen Dichtung I.* (P. W.), very laudatory review.—Fr. Rühl, *Eutropi brevium* (A. Teubner), 'a worthy companion to Wagner's ed.'—H. Ehrismann, *De temporum et modorum usu Ammiano*, 'exhaustive.'—H. Gerstenberg, *De Eutraphio Terentii interprete* (Schlee), 'contains some interesting results.' 29 Feb. A. Hilgenfeld, *Hermiae pastor graece* (W. H.), 'shows H.'s usual thoroughness and extensive learning.'

7 March. Walz, *Eckfiguren am Ostgiebel d. olymp. Zeustempels u. am Westgiebel d. Parthenon* (P. Weizsäcker), 'ought to be called: The development of river-gods in Greek art.'—A. Greifeld, *De Andriae Terentianae gemino ceitu* (Schlee), 'orients the reader in this much-discussed question.' 14 March. P. Karolidis, *Σημειώσεις τινές περὶ τῆς Μικρασιανῆς Ἀπλῆς δημοφιλίας* (O. Gruppe), 'recommended to all interested in the ethnography of Asia Minor because it contains material not easily found in so complete a form elsewhere.'—Jacobs-Wirst, *Sallust* 9A (Th. Opitz), 'in every respect an increased and improved edition.' 21 March. K. Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde II.* (R. Steig), 'let all read it who have the opportunity.'—Fr. Cumont, *Alexandre d'Abonotichos* (O. Gruppe), 'a perspicuous and fascinating picture of the man.' 28 March. Prof. Aguchekikos on totemisme (sic) (O. Gruppe), 'Germany too has its Totemists, and German readers therefore will enjoy the fine humour of the pamphlet.'—C. König, *τὰ τέλη et ol ἑν τέλει verbis quinam intelligendi sint* (O. Schulthess), a detailed criticism.—R. Swoboda, *De Demosthenis quae fer. prooemiis* (P. Uhle), 'praiseworthy industry, but does not in the least show the poems to be spurious.'—L. Kuhlmann, *Questiones Sallustianae* (Th. Opitz), 'very valuable programme.'

4 April. E. Oberhummer, *Akarnanien, Ambrakia, Amphilochien, Leukas im Altertum* (G. Biedermann),

'an excellent work showing extraordinary industry.'—W. Studemund, *Incerti scriptoris Μενάνδρου καὶ Φιλιστράτου σύγκρισις* (O. Kaehler), 'a model.'—P. Egenolf, *D. orthodoxen Stücke d. byzantinischen Litteratur* (L. Cohn), 'has collected the extremely scattered material, published and unpublished, in a most meritorious manner.'—F. K. Ginzel, *Finsterneis-Canon für . . . römische Chronologie* (W. Soltan), 'extremely valuable.' 11 April. R. Zimmermann, *De nothorum Athenis condicione* (O. Schulthess), 'all passages bearing on the question carefully collected and examined, but his arguments not convincing.'—H. Walther, *Caesaris de B. G.* (E. Wolff), 'the text is the outcome of most intelligent criticism.'—Th. Kock, *Flores Italici* (G. Stier), 'it is a real pleasure to turn over these verses.' 18 April. H. Dütschke, *Olymp* (J. Boehme), 'illustrations and text most attractive for children.'—E. Hafer, *Die Erbtochter nach attischen Recht* (O. Schulthess), the reviewer agrees in the main with the author and criticises details. 25 April. B. Lupus, *Die Stadt Syrakus im Altertum* (Th. Bindseil), 'a German work based on the *Topografia archeologica di Siracusa*, indispensable in default of the original.'—M. H. N. v. Essen, *Index Theydideus* (Widmann), 'thoroughly useful.'—C. Meissner, *Ciceronis Laelius* (W. Nitsche), 'shows thorough acquaintance with the subject.'—W. Ribbeck, *Seneca der Philosoph* (O. Weissenfels), 'gives Seneca's main views in a clear, compendious, and attractive form.'

2 May. E. Müller, *Drei griech. Vasenbilder* (H. Heydemann), 'artistic reproductions and scientific text.'—E. Wilisch, *Beiträge z. inneren Geschichte des alten Korinths* (P. Knapp), 'clear, attractive, and thorough account.'—J. Ögörek, *Sokrates i. Verhältnisse z. sein Zeit* (W. Nitsche), 'introduces the reader to the deepest problems in a manner that is clear and popular in the best sense.'—F. Müller, *Thukydides vi.* (Widmann), 'very useful.' 9 May. E. H. Meyer, (a) *Indog. Mythen*, (b) *Homer u. d. Ilias* (O. Gruppe), 'show wide reading.'—Meyer's *Reisebücher: Türkei und Griechenland* 2A. (S. Herrlich), 'a welcome addition to Badeker.'—J. Král, *Platonis Apologia et Crito* (K. J. Liebholt), the review discusses many passages.—P. Weise, *Quaestionum Cato-niarum*, Cap. V. (R. Reitzenstein), 'the most thorough and acute treatment the subject has received.' 16 May. J. P. Mahaffy, *Greek Life and Thought from the age of Alexander* (Chr. Scherer), 'complete mastery of the subject, attractive style, copious contents.'—H. Blümner, *Technologie u. Terminologie der Gewerbe u. Künste* IV. 1, 2 (M. C. P. Schmidt), 'knowledge, industry, penetration, and moderation combined.' 23 May. Iwan Müller, *Handbuch d. klass. Altertumswissenschaft* Halbbd. (G. Gilbert), favourable review.—W. Schmidt, *Der Atticismus* (K. Sittl), 'deserves recognition as a contribution to the history of the Greek language.'—J. N. Madvigii *opuscula ab ipso iterum collecta* (G. A.), 'the world of scholars will be grateful to its master for this collection.' 30 May. E. Luebbert, 1. *De Pindaricorum carminum compositione*. 2. *De Pindari studiis chronologicis*. 3. *De Pindaro dogmatis de migratione animarum cultore* (M. Rannow), a detailed criticism.—Fr. Vogel, *Diodori bibliotheca I.* (G. J. Schneider), 'an advance on Dindorf.'—R. Stölze, *Ciceronis de oratore I.* (W. Friederich), a criticism of many passages.

6 June. K. Trümpel, *Die Äthiopienländer d. Andromedamythos* (O. Gruppe), 'shows extraordinary command of the materials, and must be the base for all subsequent investigations as to the *Äthiopes*.'—R. Schubert, *Geschichte d. Agathokles* (G. J. Schneider), 'industrious but not attractive.'—E. Schwartz, *Scholien in Euripidem I.* (H. Lewy), 'a

tremendous advance on Dindorf.'—J. Schoenemann, *De lexicographis antiquis* (P. Roellig), 'a most meritorious addition to our knowledge of ancient lexicography.'—H. Wirz, *D. stoffliche u. zeitliche gliederung des bellum Jugurthinum* (Th. Opitz), 'the chronological investigations are important.'—B. Schmidt, *Catulli carmina* (K. P. Schulze), 'invites careful study.' 13 June. Seymour Conway, *Verner's Law in Italy* (W. Deecke), 'learning, acuteness, and a new point of view.'—J. J. Hartmann, *Analecta Xenophontea* (H. Kruse), 'its fresh and sometimes humorous style makes it extremely good reading.'

Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 1888.

Jan. 7. Herwerden, *Ἡροδότου ιστορίας* (i-vii), et *Appendix critica ad vol. i* (Stein): 'Text quite conservative: as to dialect, editor follows Dietsch: but book is suggestive and worth attention.'—Arndt, *Studien zur Vasenkunde*: 'Evidence of style allowed to preponderate too much over epigraphical evidence.'—14. Paley and Sandys, *Select private orations of Demosthenes* (Gruffhoff): 'Shows good knowledge of literature of subject, introductions useful.'—Kreyher, *L. Annæus Seneca u. seine Beziehungen zum Urchristenthum* (Gertz): review concluded in next number.—21. Wolff-Bellermann, *Sophokles' Aias* (Wecklein): 'Shows several improvements on G. Wolff's original edition, though text is not formed on true critical principles.'—Havot, *Cours élémentaire de métrique grecque et latine* (Klotz): 'The elementary questions clearly presented, book contains also many noteworthy suggestions.'—28. E. H. Meyer, *Homer und die Ilias* (Kammer): 'Base of poem was an Achilleis, made in ninth century in semi-Ionic Smyrna by poet of North Achaean race: to this was added a 'Warfare of Diomedes' made c. 800 by a poet of Cyme: about same time a Locrian work on 'Death of Patroclus', in middle of eighth century three Homeridae composed 'The fight by the ships,' the 'Cheating of Zeus' and the 'Fight by the wall.' These various poems unified about 760 B.C. when a 'Hektor-eis' was made by a Chian: which during seventh century was incorporated with the enlarged Achilleis aforesaid by poets who contributed additions and brought poem to its present form.'—Madvig et Ussing, *T. Livii hist. lib. (vol. 3), ed. 2.*—Weissenborn-Müller, *T. Livii lib. 31-35*, ed. 2.

Feb. 4. M. Schanz, *Platonis opera quae feruntur omnia*, p. iii: *Sophista* (O. Apelt): 'Owing to labours of previous scholars, especially Badham, editor's task has been to elect between, rather than originate, corrections in this dialogue. His judgment, save in a few places, is as good as in the portions of his edition previously published.'—Gaiser, *Des Synesius von Cyrene ägyptische Erzählungen* (R. Runze): 'Interesting so far as it goes.'—Baehrens, *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius* (Dombart): 'A few very good emendations: others plausible: vulgarate often felicitously defended: yet too often text represented, though corruptly, by the authoritative MSS. is set aside.'—P. Corssen, *Epistularum Paulinorum codices* (Rönsch): 'An examination of relation of D to F and G.'—11. Hartel, *Luciferi Calaritani opuscula* (Dombart): 'Editor's name a sufficient recommendation.'—Klussmann, *Curarum Tertullianearum particulae tres* (Rönsch).—Ascoli, *Sprachwissenschaftliche Briefe* (Ziener): 'Ascoli, the Curtius of Italy, here takes a line which promises a rapprochement between the old and young schools of philology.'—18. Heidenheim, *Die Arten der Tragödie Aristoteles* (Wecklein): 'Much ingenuity, but too often marred by failure to recognise obvious meaning of the text of the Poetics.'—V. Brochard, *Les Scriptiques Grecs* (Pappenheim): 'Bril-

hant and valuable: contains many fine original criticisms. The empirical Sceptics are, he says, the true ancestors of positivism: only they did not call their knowing knowledge.'—Roehrig, *De P. Nigidio Figulo capita duo* (Breysig): 'On the life of an eminent partisan of Pompeius.'—25. O. Jahn, *Διογενίου ἡ Λογγίνου ὅρους* 2. ed. by Vahlen (Wendland): 'Editor with his well-known accuracy uses new material obtained since Jahn's own edition to supplement that used by Jahn. True text restored in several places: in others sense elucidated by a better punctuation.'—Ussing, *T. Macci Planti comœdiæ v. iii. p. 1: cont. Casinam et Cistellariam* (O. Seyffert): 'This volume completes the edition. At end he gives a fuller apparatus, showing readings not only of B but also of E (Ambros.) and J (Britann.): 'Deserves thanks of scholars. A few oversights due to rapidity of work. Mai's arrangement of fragments of lost parts of Cistellaria reproduced unquestioningly.'—Rawlinson, *A Sketch of Universal History, vol. i. Ancient History*: 'Judicious, and very useful.'—Apponyi (Comes) et Abel, *Isotæ Nogardæ Veronensis opera* (Hartfelder).

March 3. Ribbeck, *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung*: 'Object, besides collecting facts for use of students, is to give form and life to dead, fragmentary material. No one better fitted than editor for this task. No learned notes; quotations given in translation: promised appendix is to make up, partially, for this.'—10. Niese, *Flavii Josephi opera p. i. ii.* (Frick): 'This first instalment based on true critical principles: material mostly gathered by editor himself from 7 codd., best being 1 Paris and 1 Bodl.: auxiliary evidence well discussed in Prolegomena. Where he fails to restore true text, it is due to corruption of archetype.'—G. Thilo et H. Hagen *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergili carmina commentarii v. iii. p. 1* (Goetz): 'Continues the notes on the Bucolics and Georgics.'—17. Bechtel, *Die Inschriften des ionischen Dialekts* (Larfeld): 'Excellent.'—Illman *De Tibullii codicis Ambrosiani auctoritate* (H. Magnus).—Jannery *La Géométrie grecque* (Günther). 'Valuable both for facts brought to light, and as an example of sound method of research.'—P. Gardner, *A catalogue of the Greek coins in the British Museum, ed. by R. S. Poole: Peloponnesus, excluding Corinth* (Weil): 'Introductions careful and instructive.'—Treuber, *Geschichte der Lykier, and Beiträge zur Geschichte der Lykier* (K. Sittl): 'Constitutional and external history chiefly considered: treatment of mythical and early historic periods less satisfactory. Geography briefly treated, as also is Culture. No inquiry into

date of completion of Hellenising process.'—24. Stoffel, *Histoire de Jules César, Guerre civile* (Schneider): 'Useful both for the general student and the specialist.'—Eusner, *C. Sallustii Crispi Catilina, Jugurtha, ex historiis orationes et epistulae* (Kuhlmann): 'Marks an advance in Sallustian criticism, in spite of some blemishes.'—H. Jordan, *De C. Sallustii Crispi historiæ libri ii. reliquiis* (Schmalz): 'A last and posthumously published work of the great Sallustian scholar.'—31. Usener, *Epicurea* (Lortzing): 'The ripe fruit of many years of diligent study, wide learning, and acute critical insight. Most valuable is this exhibition, after exact critical investigations, of the fragments preserved in Diog. Laertius, with prefatory account of the nature of that compiler's work.'—E. Herzog, *Geschichte und System der römischen Staatsverfassung* (Schiller): 'Well acquainted with all recent works on the subject, author preserves an independent judgment, based on correct and ample knowledge of original authorities throughout. He never uses a superfluous word.'

Rheinisches Museum, xliii. 3, contains:—

E. Klebs, *Die Vita des Avidius Cassius*. 'Spurious, author probably Lollius Urbicus.'—R. Thurneysen, *Zur Inschrift v. Cornefinum*. Sense partially elucidated.—F. Dümmler, *Skenische Vasenbilder*. The interest of *Mus. R. Antich. II. tav. 1. 4* for the origin of the drama.—Joh. de Arnim, *Philodemea*. Supplying lacunæ (or sense) in τῶν περὶ θανάτου IV. —Fr. Marx, *Studia Cornificiana*. On MSS. value, with emendations.—K. Brugmann, *Lateinische Etymologien*: 1. *sinister, laeco-s.* 2. *reciproco-s, procul*, 3. *equifer, ovifer*.—L. Cohn, *Unedrite Fragment aus der atticistischen Literatur*.—F. Schöll, *Interpolationen, Lücken, und sonstige Verderbnisse in Ciceros Rede de domo*.—R. Reitzenstein, *Die Uebersetzung des Lexicon des Hesychios*. 'The Cyrillic Glossary has been incorporated into Hesychius by some later lexicographer.'—O. Crusius, *Zu Plutarch*. Replies to Gereke (*Rh. M.* xli. 470) and Heinze (*Burs. Jhrb.* 1885, p. 125).—E. Rohde, *Zu Apuleius, Mt. IV.*—VI.

Miscellen:—

A. Ludwig, *Zu den Kypria des Stasinus*. Restoring ll. 1–7.—W. Schmid, *Zu Thukydides II. 2*. Defending δύο ἡμέρας.—E. Rohde, *Stichometrisches*.—O. Crusius, *Die Adagia des Hermodorus Rhegus*. A citation in Du Cange bearing on Byzantine Paremigraphi and *Rh. M.* xlii. 398.—F. Buecheler, *Altes Latein XIV*. On two glosses in Philoxenos, *collifana* and *siat*.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

Aeschylus. The Seven against Thebes. With an Introduction and Notes by A. W. Verrall and M. A. Bayfield. School edition. 12mo. pp. 156. Macmillan. 2s. 6d.
Cicero. Cato Major, De Senectute. With an Introduction, Notes, and a Vocabulary. Post 8vo. pp. 96. Gill. 1s.
Collins (T.). Easy Translations from Latin Prose Authors for retranslation into Latin, with Notes. Post 8vo. pp. 106. Bell & Sons. 2s.
Colson (F. H.). Stories and Legends: A First Greek Reader, with Notes, Vocabulary, and Exercises. 12mo. pp. xxiii. 219. Macmillan. 3s.
Euripides. *Heracleidae*. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by C. S. Jerram. 12mo. Clarendon Press. 3s.

Gibson (W. S.). An Introduction to Latin Syntax. 12mo. pp. 144. Clarendon Press. 2s.
Hardy (H. J.). A Latin Reader for the Lower Forms in Schools. 12mo. pp. 188. Macmillan. 2s. 6d.
Livy. Liber Quintus cum Annotationibus a Jacobo Prendeville. Bell & Sons. 1s. 6d.
Marshall (I.). Vocabulary to Xenophon's Anabasis, compiled for the use of Schools. 16mo. 68 pp. Oxford Clarendon Press. 1s. 6d.
Ovid. *Fasti*. Books V. and VI. with English Notes by F. A. Paley. 3rd edition, revised. 12mo. pp. 128. Cambridge Texts. Bell & Sons. 2s.
Owen (E. C.). Latin Syntax, for the use of Upper Forms. Post 8vo. pp. 160. Rivingtons. 4s. 6d.
Paley (F. A.). Fragments of the Greek Comic Poets,

- with renderings in English Verse. Post 8vo. pp. 150. Sonnenschein. 4s. 6d.
- Pliny*. Epistles. Book iii. Literally translated, with Notes, by John Perkins. Post 8vo. pp. 38. Hall (Cambridge). Sewed. 2s.
- Plutarch's Morals*: Ethical Essay. Translated with Notes and Index, by Arthur Richard Shilleto. Bohn's Classical Library. 12mo. pp. 410. Bell & Sons. 5s.
- Postgate* (J. P.) and *Vince* (C. A.). The New Latin Primer. Post 8vo. pp. 204. Cassell. 2s. 6d.
- Rutherford* (W. G.). First Greek Grammar, new edition. Post 8vo. pp. ix. 185. Macmillan. 2s.
- Sargent* (J. Y.). A Latin Prose Primer. 12mo. pp. 160. Macmillan. 2s. 6d.
- Underhill* (H. G.). Easy Exercises in Greek Accidence. 12mo. pp. viii. 126. Macmillan. 2s.
- Virgil's Aeneid*, Books I. and II., III. and IV., V. and VI. with English Notes and Arguments, abridged from Prof. Conington's edition, by the late Rev. J. G. Sheppard. 12mo. pp. 146, 132, 184. (Cambridge Texts.) Bell & Sons. 1s. 6d., 2s., 1s. 6d.
- Xenophon*. Anabasis. Book VI. and VII. with Map. 16mo. pp. 47—111. Rivingtons. 6d. each or with Notes and Vocabulary 1s. each.
- FOREIGN BOOKS.
- Beurlier* (E.). Les Courses de Taureaux chez les Grecs et chez les Romains. 8vo. 28 pp. *Extr.* Mémoires de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France.
- Beyle* (F.). Quaestiones Appuleianae. 8vo. 67 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Blass* (F.). Ueber die Aussprache des Griechischen. 3rd revised edition. 8vo. viii. 140 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 3 Mk. 50.
- Brunn* (Prof. H.). Geschichte der griechischen Künstler. 2nd edition (15 parts). Part I. 8vo. 48 pp. Stuttgart. Ebner und Seubert. 1 Mk.
- Dinarchi orationes adjectis Demadis qui fertur fragmentis* *ὁρίης τῆς δαδκαρίας*, iterum ed. F. Blass. 12mo. xxiv. 95 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk.
- Dürr*. Das Leben Juvenals. 4to. 30 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 20.
- Ess* (F.). Quaestiones Plinianae. De praepositionum cum ablativo apud Plinium Secundum usu. 4to. 39 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 2 Mk.
- Gemoll* (A.). Homerische Blätter. II. Striegau. 18 pp. Programm.
- Hartel* (W.). Kritische Versuche zur fünften Dekade des Livius. 8vo. 80 pp. Wien, Tempsky. 1 Mk. 20.
- Hoffmann* (H.). Platon's Philebus, erläutert und beurteilt. 4to. 23 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 80 Pf.
- Jung* (A.). De homine Homeric. 33 pp. Programm.
- Kurz* (E.). Ueber den Octavius des Minucius Felix, mit dem Text von Cap. 20—36 incl. B.—Die Persius Scholien nach den Berner Handschriften, II.: Die Scholien zu Sat. II. and III. nebst dem Text von Sat. II. and III. nach Cod. Bern. 257. 8vo. viii, 59 pp. Burgdorf. Langlois. 1 Mk. 20.
- Landgraf* (G.). Untersuchungen zu Caesar und seinen Fortsetzern, insbesondere über Autorschaft und Komposition der Bellum Alexandrinum und Africanum. 8vo. 136 pp. Erlangen. Deichert. 3 Mk.
- Lehmann* (B.). Quaestiones sacerdotales. Particula I. De titulis ad sacerdotiorum apud Graecos venditionem pertinentibus. 8vo. 57 pp. Königsberg. Koch. 1 Mk. 50.
- Leichsenring* (O.). De metris graecis quaestiones onomatologae. 8vo. 48 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Livy*. Cum apparatus critico ed. Aug. Luchs. Vol. III. libros XXI—XLV. continens. 8vo. vii. 293 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 3 Mk.
- Lotin* (E.). De dum, donec, quoad particularum usu apud Terentium commentatio. 4to. 21 pp. Leipzig. Simmel & Co. 1 Mk. 20.
- Maisel* (J.). Observations in Cassium Dionem. 24 pp. Gudemann (A.). De Heroidum Ovidii codice Planudeo quae supersunt. 90 pp. 8vo. Berlin, Calvary. 4 Mk. 50.
- Berliner Studien vol. VIII. part 1.
- Meisterhans* (K.). Grammatik der attischen Inschriften. 2nd enlarged and revised edition. 8vo. xii, 273 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 6 Mk. 50.
- Neue* (F.). Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. Vol. II. Adjectiva, Numeralia, Pronomina, Adverbia, Praepositionen, Conjunctionen, Interjectionen. 3. gänzlich neu bearb. Aufl. v. C. Wagener. Part
- I. Adjectiva. 8vo. 64 pp. Berlin. Calvary & Co. Subscription price, 1 Mk. 50 per part, or 2 Mk. for separate parts.
- Neumann* (H.). de futuri in praeorum Latinorum vulgari vel cotidiano sermoni vi et usu. Particula I. 8vo. 61 pp. Breslau. Köbner. 1 Mk.
- Petzke* (P.). Dicendi genus Tacitinum quatenus differat a Liviano. 8vo. 80 pp. Königsberg. Koch. 2 Mk.
- Posnansky* (H.). De Nemeseos monumentis. 8vo. 30 pp. Breslau. Köbner. 1 Mk.
- Ritter* (R.) ed. Preller (L.). Historia philosophiae graecae. Testimonia auctorum conlegerunt notisque instruxerunt H. R. et L. P. Pars secunda septimum edita. Physicorum doctrinae recognitae a Fr. Schultess. 8vo. vi. 181—598. Gotha. F. A. Perthes. 6 Mk. 40. (I. II. 10 Mk.)
- Rossignol* (J. P.). De l'éducation et de l'instruction des hommes et des femmes chez les anciens. 8vo. 336 pp. Labitte.
- Schmid* (S.). Untersuchung über die Frage der Echtheit der Rede pro M. Marcello. 8vo. 123 pp. Zürich. Klemm. 1 Mk. 20.
- Schneider* (J.). De temporum apud praeos scriptores latinis usu quaestiones selectae. 8vo. 34 pp. Breslau. Köbner. 1 Mk.
- Schultess* (F.). Annaeana studia. 4to. 61 pp. Hamburg. Herold. 2 Mk. 50.
- Spindler* (G.). De Zoilo Homeromastige qui vocatur. 15 pp. Programm.
- Stangl* (Th.). Tulliana et Mario-Victoriniana. 8vo. 60 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 20.
- Tomasehek* (W.). Kritik der ältesten Nachrichten über den skythischen Norden I. Ueber das Arimasische Gedicht des Aristae. 8vo. 66 pp. Wien. Tempsky. 1 Mk.
- Treu* (M.). Maximi Planudis epistulae. Particula tertia. 8vo. pp. 97—144. Programm.
- Unger* (G. F.). Der Gang des altrömischen Kalenders Aus Abhandl. der K. K. Akademie der Wiss. 4to. 117 pp. München. Franz. 3 Mk. 50.
- Urlichs* (L. von) ein Medea-Sarkophag. 8vo. 22 pp. with one plate. Würzburg. Stahel. 1 Mk.
- Verhandlungen der 39. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Zürich vom 23 Sept. bis 1 Oct. 1887. 4to. x. 374 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 12 Mk.
- Wackermann* (Dr.). Ueber das Lectisternium. 4to. 28 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Wendt* (Dr. G.). Griechische Schulgrammatik. 8vo. xvi. 287 pp. Berlin. Grote, bound. 2 Mk. 60.
- Winkler* (A.). De inferorum in vasis Italiae inferioris representationibus. 8vo. 30 pp. Breslau. Köbner. 1 Mk.
- Wissmann* (F. O.). de genere dicendi Xenophonteo deque prioris Hellenicorum partis condicione quaestiones selectae. 8vo. 39 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Zacher* (K.). Die Aussprache des Griechischen. Vortrag. 8vo. 52 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.